

The University of Chicago
Libraries



DUPRETT COLLECTION





QUÆSTIONES MOSAICÆ,

OR
BOOK OF GENESIS

COMPARED WITH THE

REMAINS OF ANCIENT RELIGIONS

BY

OSMOND DE BEAUVOIR PRIAULX.

Μὴ νῦν ἐν ἡθοὺς μοῦνον ἐν σαρτῷ φόρει,
Ὡς φῆς σὺ, κόνειν ἄλλο, τοῦτ' ὁρῶς ἔχειν.

SOPHOCLES.

~~~~~  
FROM THE CREATION TO THE DEATH OF ABRAHAM.  
~~~~~

LONDON:
JOHN BOHN, 17, HENRIETTA-STREET,
COVENT-GARDEN.

—
MDCCCXLII.

V1600 INT
70 V/MU
83111111 00A 110

BS 1236

P 9

473507

P R E F A C E.

THE host of writers who have commented on the Bible may be divided into three great parties. The first in point of numbers and discipline and authority is unquestionably the party of "the orthodox." They reverence in the Bible an inspired book, the Book of Truth. But as their age has also *its truths*, and truths which none but a few unhappy thinkers ever venture to doubt, to these truths our orthodox commentators struggle to fashion their text : and we find them consequently with Scripture now confirming error, and with Scripture now opposing and now ratifying the new deductions of science. With them the Bible has as many meanings as man has opinions.—The second in point of time, the last in point of numbers and authority, are "the infidels." They despise the religion of which the Bible is the symbol ; they see the present and the present only ; they have eyes but for themselves and their own wants. Into the spirit

D 5176

of the ancient world they seek not to penetrate : it is not their spirit : and the forms of old religion are for them therefore but the cunning devices of priestcraft to ensnare men's souls.—The third party, “the rationalists,” are of modern date : they form a middle class between the orthodox and the infidel. They have appreciated the wants of their age, and with reverence they have approached the remains of antiquity : they have caught some portion of its spirit : but they have erred in that they have translated into modern language the idioms of a society long since extinct ; in that they have seen only the naked fact, and not the fact as seen by those who have transmitted it to us. They have made the ancient world a confused

anticipation reflexion of the modern.

To no one of these classes do I belong. I have no preconceived theory to which I would wrest the text I have attempted to elucidate. I have sought but to ascertain the views and opinions of which the Pentateuch may be considered the expression. I began therefore by putting aside all question of its inspiration, well assured however, that if indeed inspired, the fact would press itself upon me at every line. I then read Genesis, to

which I intended to confine my labours, in connexion with the laws of Moses, and the religion of the Jews as it appears in the Prophets. And as I believe that the same stages of civilization best understand and best represent each other, with the rites and the religion of Moses I compared the rites and the religion of other ancient people. I looked for his views not in the fables of the Talmudists or the ponderous tomes of commentators, but in the Vedas, the Laws of Menu, the Zendavesta, the Kings of China, the traditions of Greece, and the legends and customs of half-civilized man. I found different nations uttering the same cry, speaking the same thought though not indeed in the same phrase, and I made nation interpret the language of nation. In this way I endeavoured to seize the life and spirit of the olden world, and that life and spirit I compared and contrasted with the life and spirit of modern society.

But again, in studying the olden religions I could not but observe that although at their several "points of departure" they rather resemble, yet in their full development they rather differ from, each other. In their cosmogonies

then, their first views of God and the world, I sought for the origin of those peculiarities which subsequently give to each of these religions its character and individuality. Hence an essay towards an "*Esprit des Religions*."

But that I may not raise expectations which must be disappointed, I will at once state that I know nothing of the oriental languages. My ignorance, of Hebrew especially, I have often had cause to regret ;—and to the study of Hebrew at least I should certainly have applied myself, had I not been aware that I did not possess those philological talents which are absolutely necessary to the critical knowledge of a language.

With regard to the temper in which I have written, I have been told that I am occasionally guilty of a sneer ;—all I can answer is, that if there be a sneer, it is on the lip only and not in the heart ; and that if I have been betrayed into any irreverent contempt for the opinions of others (of which I am not conscious), it has been through fear of falling into that mincing Jesuitism which is one of the crying faults of our age.

CHAPTER I.

GENESIS I. 1-31; II. 1-3.

VERSE 1: "IN the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." In the beginning of what? Not of the universe certainly, for the universe yet was not; and not of God's existence, for God's existence is infinite and eternal. In the beginning then—of creation? What? Had the Elohim, as, in the Indian scheme, the great Brahme, hitherto "dwelt in some egg, Himself meditating on Himself?"¹ and was "the first inclination of the Godhead to diversify himself by creating worlds,"—was the first desire,³ the first thought⁴ that gave a ripple to the calm

¹ "The world," says Menu, "was all darkness, undiscernable, undistinguishable altogether, as in a profound sleep, till the self-existent, invisible God, making it manifest with five elements and other glorious forms, perfectly dispelled the gloom (comp. Heb. xi. 30). He, desiring to raise up various creatures by an emanation from his own glory, first created the waters, and impressed them with a power of motion; by that power was produced a golden egg, in which was born Brahme, self-existing, the great Parent of all rational beings. The God having dwelt in the egg through revolving years, *Himself meditating on Himself*, divided it into equal parts, and from those halves framed the heaven and the earth."—Sir W. Jones *On the Gods of Greece*. Asiatic Researches, vol. i. p. 244.

² "The Indian *Maya*, the first

inclination of the Godhead to diversify Himself by creating worlds, is feigned to be the Mother of universal Nature."—Id. p. 230.

³ "Then was there no entity nor nonentity; no world, nor sky, nor aught above it. Death was not, nor then was immortality, nor distinction of day or night. But *THAT* breathed without afflation, single, with her who is sustained within him. Other than Him, nothing existed which has since been. Darkness there was, for the universe was enveloped with darkness; but that mass which was covered by the husk was at length produced by the power of contemplation. First *desire was produced in the mind*, and that was the original productive seed."—From the Rig-veda, by Colebrook, A.R. viii. 404.

⁴ "Originally this universe was indeed soul only; nothing else whatsoever existed active or inactive.

of an hitherto unconscious existence—was the great Word⁵, the first-born, that broke the eternal silence, “the Beginning?” Impossible. Can God then, as, in the Persian faith, that lifeless spectre Zeruane Akerene, that terrible abstraction, Time unchequered, indefinite, uncreate, have subsisted alone? And does “in the beginning” allude to the sublime intelligences which first peopled the boundless solitudes—to the creation of the Ormuzds and Ahrimans,⁶ the Sephiroths and evil angels of the Cabala?⁷ Or is it to be referred to the first birth of the pure Honover,⁸ the powerful living word of Ormuzd, the holy Logos⁹ of Christianity, which afterwards called into being the heavens and the earth, and the waters, and the pure worlds of light? Again impossible. God is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever: moved by no impulses, urged by no

He *thought*, “I will create worlds.” Thus He created water, light, mortal beings, and the waters.”—Id. p. 420.

⁵ “Knowing the elements, discovering the worlds, and recognizing all quarters and regions to be Him, and worshipping speech, or revelation, who is the first-born, &c.”—Yajurveda, id. p. 433.

⁶ The two, Ormuzd and Ahri-man, in the course of their existence, are the sole productions of Time without bounds. Of the productions of the pure world, Ormuzd first made the heaven, that world of light which was the pure law of the Mehestans. He then made Ardibehescht, then Schariver, &c.” Here, the Amshaspands are the creation of Ormuzd; such also they are represented in the Jescht of Bahman Ardibehescht, v. ii. p. 152, Zend. In the xix Farg. p. 413, v. i, Zend, they are spoken of as the production of Zeruane-Akerene: “L’Être absorbé dans l’excellence ta donné; il a aussi donné avec grandeur les Amshaspands, qui sont de pures productions et de saints rois.”

⁷ “Before the great cause of all

causes, the most secret of secret things, created the world; before He created objects cognizable by the intellect or produced form, He was Himself,” say the Cabalists, “alone, without figure or similitude. But when creation commenced, His existence being only demonstrable by His energies, from the immensity of His own essence sprung forth the first of the divine *Sephiroth* or enumerations, communicating in various degrees an unceasing influx of Deity to nine others, all of which, combined, display to us a tenfold idea of the Deity.”—Book of Enoch, Prelim. History, by Laurence.

⁸ St. John’s Gospel, c. i. v. 1.

⁹ Zendavesta, xix. Farg. ut supra, and Id. xix. Ha, vol. i. 139. The word of Ormuzd, the word given of God, is the pure Honover which existed before the heaven and the earth.” “J’ai prononcé la parole avec grandeur, moi qui suis absorbé dans l’excellence; et tous les êtres purs qui ont été faits, ont courus dans le monde d’Ormuzd.” And again (I Carde. vol. i. p. 186), “J’invoque la parole, source de tout, sainte, pure et grande.”

wants, but following out His own beneficent laws, He has ever wrought, from all eternity. Yes, He *has ever wrought*, and yet in Him, the Ideal and the Real, Thought and Being, are one and the same. Yes, He *ever works*, and yet for Him have ever existed both this glorious spectacle the earth, and this blue heaven, in which myriads of worlds roll their predestined courses. Yes, He *will work ever*, and yet to Him time can bring no change; before Him, all that ever has been, all that is, all that ever will be, is continually present; in Him eternity has no past, no future, for Him it is but a moment, as a moment is for Him eternity.

For God, there is no beginning and no end of work—no first and no last essay in creation: but *man*, as he travels back from age to age, at length grows weary of the ever-receding vista of bye-gone centuries, and he therefore closes his eyes, and stills his impatient mind, with a word, “In the beginning.” And “in the beginning,” when, so God had from all eternity willed it, Time began; when man first stepped into existence—man, to whom God gave much of earth, and something of Himself; man, in whom the real and the ideal are not *identical*, but rather *antagonist* principles, and who is Nature’s servant or God’s worshipper, as the one or the other dominates his life—in the beginning of Time and as the beginning of History, of that great race which Humanity has to run, and for which we have yet scarce girded up our loins, of that race, whose goal, after six thousand years of labour, is even now beyond our horizon,—God created Heaven, earth, and man.

But was Moses, indeed, thus impressed with God’s infinity? I doubt it. All infant people reject the merely intelligible; they ask for something that appeals to their senses, something which they can comprehend. Speak to them of the self-sustained heaven, or of the round world,

¹ “Les Tlascalans croyoient la terre plate, et n’ayant aucune idée de la révolution des corps célestes, ils étoient persuadés que le soleil et la lune dormoient à la fin de leurs cours.” Hist. Gen. des Voy-

held in its course by opposite and counteracting forces, and they will laugh you to scorn. But place Heaven on the broad shoulders of Atlas, or on the ever-growing Albordj,² "or the sun-bright Meru:"³ rest the flat earth on marble⁴ pillars, or the tortoise-back, and you bring before them causes with which they are familiar, and which seem to them sufficient; you amuse their imaginations, and they will not enquire into the cause of your cause; and years may pass away, perhaps centuries, ere they perceive that they have got rid of one difficulty only to meet another and a greater. Similarly, speak to them of God, as He reveals Himself to rational man; insist upon His infinite, His universal nature; show them that to His spiritual existence no conceptions into which time or space enters are applicable; and will not a strong array of cherished associations and accustomed thoughts angrily rise up from their minds' depths to drive back your force of reason? Tell them, however, of a God who rules the storm and wills the earthquake, who gives corn and harvest, and dispenses light and heat to man; of one, who even framed this earth and created these heavens; and so long as you dwell merely on God's power, thus exercised the most human of his attributes, they will comprehend, and perhaps eagerly receive, your words. But from your words, can we conclude, that either you, or they whom you address, have any but very narrow conceptions of God? What, then, shall we say, when at the head of an ancient cosmogony which similarly describes the Deity, we meet with a phrase so ambiguous as this "In the beginning"? Shall we torture it into some meaning not contradictory of a rational apprehension of God? Or shall we, assuming in its author views natural to his age, give to the words their most obvious sense, and refer them to some beginning in

ages, vol. xviii. p. 597, from Herrera. The Peruvians held much the same notions, *vide* Hist. des Yncas, p. 106.

² According to the Persian books.

³ According to the Vedas.

⁴ Seems to have been the opinion of the Jews even so late as the times of the author of the Book of Enoch. "I surveyed the stone which supports the corners of the earth." Enoch, xviii. 2.

creation, *some beginning in eternity*, or some first consciousness of the Diety of Himself?⁵

But what have I myself done? Have I not, following out the laws of the human reason, sought by them to determine the laws and character of a perfect and infinite existence? Miserable sophist! Does not a world of facts rise up to confute me? To my speculations the plain man has but to oppose this solid earth, and man's iron will; and what can I answer him? Have I not left them unaccounted for, and unaccountable. These and a thousand other facts shall I now gloze over with a show of

⁵ Compare Gen. i. 2, which describes God's spirit moving on the face of the waters, with the first motion ascribed to the Godhead in the Hindoo books (vide note¹ p. 1, sup.). See also the Cosmogony of the Parsis in the Boun-Debesch vol. ii, Zend., and compare with it the doctrine of the Cabala (note 7); also the Neaesch of the Sun, ii. p. 8, Zend., where Ormuzd is thus addressed, "Juste Juge, éclatant de gloire et de lumière, qui sçavez tout, agissant, Seigneur des seigneurs, Roi élevé sur tous les rois, Créateur qui donnez aux créatures la nourriture nécessaire de chaque jour, grand, fort, *qui êtes dès le commencement*, &c." And observe the character of the first God, as given us from the Hermetic Books by Iamblichus: "*προ των οντως οντων εστι θεος εις, πρωτος η του πρωτου θεου και βασιλεως, ακινητος εν μονοτητι της εαυτου ενοτητος μενων· ουτε γαρ νοητον αυτω επιπλεχεται, ουτε αλλο τι παραδειγμα δε ιδρυται του αυτοπατρος, αυτογονου, του μονοπατρος θεου, του οντως αγαθου· μεiron γαρ τι ες πρωτον, ες πηγη των παντων, και πυθμην των νοουμενων πρωτων ειδων οντων· απο τε του ενος τουτου, ο αυταρχης θεος εαυτου εξελαμψε, διο και αυτοπατωρ, και αυταρχης· αρχη γαρ ουτος ες θεος θεωρ,*" &c. "Ante eas res quæ veræ sunt, est Deus unus, prior etiam

primo Deo et rege; est ille immobilis, in solitudine suæ unitatis permanens, neque enim intellectuale ei imminiscetur, neque aliquid aliud, estque exemplar ipsius, qui est sui pater, et de se genitus, et unipater Deus et vere bonus. Est enim majus quid et prius, fons omnium et radix intelligibilium, idearum primarum entium. Ab hoc autem uno Deus per se sufficiens se ipse explicuit; proinde est sui pater et sibi sufficiens. Est enim hic et principium et Deus decorum."—De Mysteriis, &c. viii, c. ii, and consult Gale's notes on this passage. I am aware of the doubts thrown upon the books of Hermes. I know that they are said to have been compiled "out of the works of Plato and the divine Scriptures." (Stanley Hist. Phil. 159) I know that Iamblichus has been styled a dreamer and a madman (De Pauw, Egyptiens, &c. vol. ii. § vii. p. 149); still in the passage above I see so much that accords with the notions of Persian and Indian priests (see especially the cosmogony in Polier Mythologie des Indiens, vol. i. p. 163), that though somewhat Platonized (see Doctr. of Plato, by Picus de Mirandula, in Stanley, § i, p. 196), I cannot but believe that it pretty fairly expresses the Egyptian idea of the first God.

subtle argument? Or shall I, with a despairing scepticism, either doubt their existence, or doubt that we can know aught of God? God forbid! God, in truth, can never be other than very partially, very dimly known to us. But in Him, indivisible, yet multitudinous, One, yet universal, in Him, I feel, that all things contradictory, all things discordant—save weakness, error, sin—meet and blend together with a harmony which saints and angels live to contemplate; and I content myself, therefore, with the belief of the wise apostle, “Through faith we understand, that the worlds were framed by the Word of God.”

“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” “Created,” not merely gave *form* to chaos, or *another order* to old materials, but bid chaos itself exist. So we understand the term; but did Moses so understand it?

Not invariably certainly; for it is from water that the great whales (“and God created great whales”) are brought forth, and out of the earth that cattle and creeping things are made; and even though man (Gen. i. 27) is said to have been created in God’s image, yet that creation is afterwards (Gen. ii. 7) limited to a mere arrangement or composition of existent materials,—“God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.”⁶

In this first verse of Genesis then? If Moses have here used “created” in its strict and only proper sense, then as he has applied it to heaven and earth equally, he has applied it to them both in the same sense, and both consequently exist, though the latter, and the latter only (for two chaoses are an impossibility), exists as chaos (ver. 2). But if heaven⁷ already exist, how is it that the creation of

⁶ I find this argument in Beausobre Hist. des Manichéens, lib. v. c. iv. He refers to Isaiah xiv. 7, where the terms Bara, Jatsar, and Asah, are all used indiscriminately. vol. ii. p. 206.

⁷ I am aware that *the heaven in the first verse* has been supposed by commentators to allude to the supreme heaven, in which are the throne of God and the habitation of the angels; while *that in the*

heaven^s is the work of the second day, and appears, like the after creation of the world, as a mere arrangement, a separation of the waters? How, besides, could the whole creation be called a six days' labour, when an indefinite period is allowed for the creation of that which was alone created—Chaos? Taking then the term "created" in the sense of produced, formed, arranged, I conclude that *this first* verse is but the summary and prefatory verse,—the "*arma virumque cano*"—of Moses' hymn of the creation; that *the second* shows us the matter on which God wrought; and that *with the third* only really commences the first act of creation: the spirit of God then moves on the face of the waters, and his voice is then first heard,—“Let there be light.” I regard, then, the creation of Moses, with the exception, perhaps, of the creation of light, as a mere arrangement of pre-existent though confused materials.”

Verse 2: “And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was on the face of the deep.” “I do not

eighth verse is the heaven in which are the planets, &c., belonging to our system. I, however, remember nothing in the books of Moses which implies, nor, I must own, can I conceive, this tier of heavens; I cannot understand how God is more in one place than another, and I cannot give a local habitation to pure spirits. To be blessed they surely need no white raiments, no jasper thrones, no gates of pearl, no walls of sapphire, or emerald, or chrysolite, and no cities of pure gold like unto glass;—not of such dross is their heaven: and if for our material natures heaven must be described materially, surely as the spirit of God rested *not* upon eastern kings or the throned Cæsars, but on the lowly carpenter's son, so some bleak and barren, and despised heath, made glorious by the presence of God, and the joy, and peace, and love of his saints, had

better pictured heaven to us, than all this accumulation of the too-much loved riches of earth.

⁸ I know nothing of Hebrew, and have turned the argument on the word “created.” In *Nimrod* (iv. p. 110), by I believe the Hon. Algernon Herbert, however, I find that the words translated “the heavens” are “*eth hasciamaim*,” and that *eth* “is usually rendered essence,” according to Hottinger; and that Fabre d’Olivet “renders it self-sameness an equivalent phrase.” How far all this is correct I necessarily am unable to determine. I can only observe, that the context does not favour this translation; and that many great Hebrew scholars seem to have been unaware of the force of this little word.

⁹ The contrary opinion is advocated by Dr. Adam Clarke,—vid. Comment on Genesis, i. 1.

remember," says the learned Burnet, "that any of the ancients that acknowledged the earth to have had an original, did deny that original to have been from a chaos. We are assured of both from the authority of Moses, who saith that in the beginning the earth was *tohu-bolu*, without form and void, a fluid, dark, confused mass, without distinction of parts, but without order or any determinate form." (*Sacred Theory of the Earth*, vol. i. c. 4, p. 61.) That the Jews, the Alexandrian Jews at least, held in this respect the opinions of their age, Philo-Judæus is evidence. In his tract (*De Mundi Opif.* p. 12) he speaks not merely of the *one* cause, efficient and intelligent, but also of a *second*, passive, inert, inanimate.¹ He tells us that matter (*ουσια*) was, in its nature, without form, order, motion, was chaos in a word, and that the Deity gave it form, order, motion: that hence the world is (*γενητος*) generated, and not (*αγενητος*) eternal.² By the Brahmins it is believed that "this all once existed in darkness, imperceptible, undefinable, undiscoverable, and undiscovered, as if wholly immersed in sleep."³ With the Egyptians, as also with the Greeks, chaos was a humid mass.⁴ Among the Chaldeans, according to Berossus, it was supposed "that a time had been in which the universe, the all, was darkness and water;"⁵ and if Sanchoniatho is a fair representative of the philosophical and religious opinions of his time and country, the Phœnicians conjectured that "the beginning of all things was a wind of black air, and a chaos dark

¹ "Το μὲν εἶναι δραστηριὸν αὐτὸν, το δὲ παθητὸν. καὶ ὅτι το μὲν δραστηριὸν ὁ τῶν ὅλων νοῦς ἐστίν—το δὲ παθητὸν, ἀψυχὸν ἔξ ἀκινήτων ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ.

² From Stahl *Lehrbegriff* Philo in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*.

³ *Instit. of Menu*, c. i. by Sir W. Jones.

⁴ For the Egyptian chaos see pp. 320, 321, of Cory's *Ancient Frag.* from Damascius; for the Greek, *Idem*, p. 312; and Emeric-

David *Recherchessur Jupiter*, vol. i. p. 31.

⁵ *Εν ᾧ το παν σκοτος καὶ ὕδωρ εἶναι.* Berossus then goes on to state that this chaos was inhabited by mis-shapen monsters, paintings of which were to be seen in the temple of Belus. Vide Fabricius *Bib. Græc.* vol. xiv. p. 175, and Cory's *Anc. Frag.* p. 23. In the Egyptian hieroglyphics, according to Rosellini, chaos is similarly expressed by a confusion of the limbs and parts of various animals.

as Erebus, and that they were boundless and for many ages without bound.”⁶ And although the Chinese books nowhere, so far as I remember, directly speak of a chaos, yet, as they speak of the Heaven (Tien) and the Earth as the father and mother of all things,⁷ they imply that God and matter are co-eternal, and, as Tien is also creator, a chaos.

In reviewing these various speculations on the beginning of our world, we cannot but ask ourselves whether the existence of a chaos, that once “overwhelming necessity,”⁸ is compatible with our idea of the Deity? Whether in some corner of infinite space—its thousands of miles some creeds have not hesitated to measure⁹—darkness and confusion could ever for a moment have hid themselves from the all-seeing eye of God? World may have succeeded world, and inferior creations may have been replaced by creations more perfect, and the transitions may have been sudden, violent, terrible, in our eyes moments of disorder, all this I can very well understand; but I can never conceive, that any speck of matter has ever existed but by God’s will and subject to God’s law; nor that any, therefore, has ever existed but in its place, and that place the best, the only one, in the whole circle of the universe, fitted to the purposes for which that matter was destined and created. I cannot, therefore, conceive a chaos.¹ All

⁶ Αερα ζοφωδη και πνευματωδη, η προην αερος ζοφωδους και χαος θολερον ερεβωδες: ταυτα δε ειναι απειρα, και δια πολυν αιωνα μη εχειν περας.”—From Fourmont’s *Anciens Peuples*.

⁷ Vide Chou-King, Part iv, c. i, p. 1. “Le ciel et la terre sont le père et la mère de toutes choses.”—De Guigne’s translation.

⁸ “—πρωτα χαος αμεγαρον αναγχην.”—Orph. Arg. 12.

⁹ Its length, breadth, and depth, according to the Lamaic creed, consisted of 6,160,000 miles. See Pallas Reise, vol. ii, p. 234.

¹ But God may have willed a

chaos, it will be objected to me. The idea of purpose, design, is surely not compatible with our notion of a chaos, and yet essentially enters into our conceptions of God’s will. Besides, as the question is of a fact which transcends experience, which can be matter of speculation only, if we are to speculate—and were it not that others had ploughed the barren field, I assuredly had not put my dibble in earth—let us prefer speculations which are simple, and most in accord with the pure and loftier conceptions of God’s character.

things, every where, in all time, have, I believe, borne the mighty impress of God's plastic hand; and whatever may have been their courses, have but sustained a pre-established part in the ever-varying harmony of Nature.

"And the spirit of God moved upon² the face of the waters." This verse, while it more distinctly marks out the nature of chaos, its fluid mass, at the same time describes the "*modus operandi*," the manner in which the Deity performed His creative labours. His spirit moves upon the face of the waters, stirs them, makes them quick with life. The primal matter, and the mode in which, by the intervention of the first active principle, it was adapted to the purposes of the universe, are problems from which, however impossible they are of solution, the olden cosmogonists have never shrunk. Thus, the author of the Institutes of Menu, having first informed us that this universe existed only in darkness, adds that, "then the self-existing power, himself undiscerned but making the world discernible, with five elements and other principles, appeared with undiminished glory, dispelling the gloom, He, whom the mind can alone perceive. . . . even *He, the soul of all beings*. . . . shone forth in person. *He having wished to produce various beings from His own substance*, first with a thought created the waters, and placed in them a pro-

² The Hebrew word *Ruah*, which has been rendered "spirit of God," means "a breath," or "wind," and some translations, instead of making the spirit to move, make it to brood upon the waters, as a hen upon her eggs, thus calling to mind the mundane egg of so many cosmogonies (vide Jablonsky, *Panth. Ægypt. c. ii, § 8, p. 41*). Milton so read the passage:

"Thou from the first,
Wast present, and with mighty
wings outspread,
Dovelike sat'st, brooding on the
vast abyss,
And mad'st it pregnant."

³ "Water," says one of the com-

mentators, "comprises the principles of things, and the elements; the existence of the chaotic mass, the production and the destruction of worlds."—Colebrooke on the *Rel. Cerem. of the Hindoos*, *As. Res. vol. v, p. 351*. I suspect, however, that water holds this high place only among the Vischnuists; among the Sevaists it is usurped by fire, among others by air; while a passage in the *Yajur-Veda* (*Id. p. 432*) attributes it to them all equally: "Fire is that original cause; the sun is that; so is the air; so is the moon; such too is that pure Brahme, and those waters, and that lord of creatures."

ductive seed; the seed became an egg, bright as gold—and in that egg he was born himself, in the form of Brahme, the great forefather of all spirits. (The waters are called Nara, or the Spirit of God; and since they were his first *Ayana* or place of motion, he thence is named NARAYANA, or moving on the waters).⁴ According to San-choniatho, “the wind” (Το πνευμα), whether the black air before spoken of, or some more vital principle alluded to in that intervening passage Fourmont conjectures lost,⁵ “embraces chaos and thus generates Mot or Mud, and from Mot sprang all the seed of creation and the genesis of all things.” In the Lamaic creed, golden clouds clash together in space, and pour down deluges of rain, whence is produced a mighty sea. On this sea, by degrees, appears a foam; and from this foam come forth all living creatures and with them man; and from man, man’s Burchan or the Gods.⁶

In all these cosmogonies water⁷ plays a principal part, and it would be no difficult matter to trace out the analogies which gave it this eminent place among so many of the olden nations; but the most striking of them would be *to all* superfluous, and the more hidden and subtle *to the many* doubtful. I therefore pass on to the religious tendencies of these cosmogonies. In the two last, the world and all things else are clearly the results of chance. *There is no intelligent principle* to mould into any preconceived forms the fermenting mass. Sun, and moon, and stars,

⁴ I have not omitted this verse, because the expressions it uses closely resemble those of our own Scripture. But it seems to me so little connected with the rest of the passage, such a merely parenthetical observation, that I cannot help regarding it as the addendum of some later transcriber.

⁵ See Fourmont, *Anciens Peuples*, vol. i.

⁶ See Pallas, *ut supra*, and compare with this Lamaic cosmogony the episodes from the Mahabharat,

relating to the churning of the ocean for the purpose of obtaining the Amreeta. In this way were produced the moon, and the goddess of fortune, and of wine, and the white horse, and the tree of plenty, and the cow that grants every heart’s desire.—From the Bhagavad, by Wilkins, p. 148.

⁷ That water plays also its part in the Chinese cosmogony, see Des Guignes, *Chou-king*, Discours Prel. vol. i, p. 10.

shine forth,⁸—wherefore, none can discover: they are there, in the broad heaven, beautiful by accident; parts of one great scheme, and dependent one on the other, and mutually lending support to each other, and all by accident. *There is no intelligent principle*, and man, whose soul rises above this world and its systems, and whose history is one continuous struggle for moral excellence, is but a spawn of the teeming sea, or the offspring of wind and of night—yes, man, whose *intellect* is so imbued with the sense of order that it abhors all accidents, is himself but a piece of the finest and most complicated machinery, the very quintessence of dust—an accident. *There is no intelligent principle*, and the very gods themselves, dwarfed down into the sons of men, or of mud, are but accidents of an accident, whose will is an accident, whose law is an accident, and whose favour is an accident. They are gods; but as they have been raised to their celestial thrones only by their superior power, or for extraordinary benefits, *their simpler votaries* either kneel to them from fear and not from a grateful sense of love, or from cupidity, and not to rise again new creatures with higher and purer objects to struggle for; and *their wiser priests*, atheists at heart, hypocrites by profession, take on them the vows and offices of religion for wealth, and honour, and glory, and not in order that by precept and exhortation and example, they may lead on others in the way to Heaven.

With such cosmogonies, then, religion, metaphysically speaking, is impossible. But man is not always a *consequent* animal, and, in his infancy, he is less consequent than in his manhood. In error, he ever stops short of any glaring absurdity; he does not fear to stand in contradiction with himself. I can believe, therefore, that even where these cosmogonies have been generally⁹ received,

⁸ Vide Fourmont, § 6, ut supra.
Καὶ ἐξέλαμψε Μωϋσῆς ἡλίου τε καὶ σελήνης ἀστέρες τε καὶ ἀστρά μεγάλα.

⁹ That they ever formed an essen-

tial part of the popular creed may well admit of a doubt. They have a false air of philosophy about them, against which the common-sense

the religious feelings have been in some measure developed, and the higher aims of life, though indistinctly, perceived; and that man has never been altogether without God in the world.

The cosmogonies of Menu and of Moses recognize, each of them, an intelligent God. In both, the Creator begins His creation, moving upon the face of the waters. In *the one*, however, the genesis of Moses, He is the great, the only God; in *the other*, He is but the first creature. In Moses too, the creation is clearly distinguished from the Creator; God works upon chaos, moulds into form already existing materials. In Menu, on the other hand, as chaos existed only in the Divine mind,¹ so creation is but the manifestation of the creator; Brahme is the soul of all beings; he produces various beings from his own substance, and the great All is but God under another form. In *the former* is laid the foundations of a great and true religion; in *the latter*, there is a tendency to both pantheism and polytheism: whether, however, *the one* will keep up to its first high promise, and whether *the other* will save itself from the errors to which it seems to lean, are questions which we may probably be enabled to answer in the course of our enquiries.

We now proceed to the order of creation. On the first day God created light. "Let there be light, and there was light."² What this light might be, has naturally exercised the ingenuity of those learned commentators, who are as familiar with the creation and the counsels of God,

of the mass would immediately rise; they probably contain the dreams of an infidel priesthood.

¹ Vide note ¹, page 1.

² Longinus, in a passage, the authenticity of which is disputed, much admires the sublime grandeur of this expression. Huetius, however, in his "Demonstratio Evangelica," and later writers, have endeavoured to show that it is

no way sublime, because it is idiomatic. Whether the passage in Longinus is or is not an interpolation, except in so far as it is another evidence of the dishonesty of the early Christians, is of little importance; and notwithstanding Moses could scarcely express himself otherwise than he did, I am still content to admire.

as though they had been present *at the one* and were often called upon to take a share *in the other*. With *one party* this first light is but a dim glimmering, a sort of twilight or darkness visible; *with a second*, it is the bright Shekinah or the glorious presence; while *with a third*, it is that light, allowed to run wild probably, which is hereafter to be collected together into sun, moon, and stars.³ It is a light without a sun,—so much we know; and such a light both Menu and Zoroaster tell us of. According *to the one*, Brahme⁴ has but to appear, and the gloom is dispelled; and according *to the other*, light is the dwelling place of Ormuzd,⁵ coeternal with him; Ormuzd, in fact, himself is light. Moses held, then, on this point, *certainly* no singular and *probably* none but popular, opinions.

But this sunless light produces morning and evening; hence other difficulties. For without a sun, morning and evening are inconceivable to all, save commentators, and *they* have made the matter very clear to us. *Some* of them, reducing the Spirit of God to a rushing and tempestuous wind,⁶ (the *αερα ζοφωδη και πνευματωδη* of Sanchoniathon) have sent the world revolving about its axis, and thus alternately meeting and losing the light which God had created over half its surface: *others*, on the contrary, have made the light to follow the spirit of God brooding or moving over the face of the waters. To each of these conjectures there is one objection; *the first*, supposes a theory of the earth which was not and could not be known to Moses; and *the second*, such a conception of the Deity as no rational mind can a moment entertain. But how then account for this morning and evening? Let us for-

³ Dr. Adam Clarke (Comment.) thinks it no light, but latent heat. Moses seemingly was a chemist of the nineteenth century.

⁴ See note ¹, p. 1, from the Institutes of Menu.

⁵ "As it is written in the law of the Mehestans, that Ormuzd, who is raised above all, was with sovereign knowledge, and with purity,

in the light of the world. This throne of light, this dwelling-place of Ormuzd, is called the first light, and this sovereign science, this purity, production of Ormuzd."—Boun. Dehesch, § i.

⁶ Vide note ², p. 10, and consult Simon, Hist. Crit. du Vieux Testament, lib. iii, c. iii.

get our knowledge and our systems, let us bring to the writings of an infant people, an infantine mind, infantine trust, and the previous existence of light will quite suffice to make morning and evening very possible.

“And God divided the light⁷ from the darkness: *and God called the light day, and the darkness he called night.*” Is this night a created, or is it the original, the chaotic, darkness? In the Persian creed, so abhorrent of darkness, night and sleep are celestial,⁸ proceeding from Ormuzd; and in Moses, God nowhere gives a name, save to his creatures.

Second day (v. 6 and 8): “And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.” Similarly, in the cosmogony of Menu,⁹ Brahme divides the egg into equal parts, and from its halves produces the heaven and the earth; and similarly too, in that of Berossus, Belus or Jupiter divided the darkness in the midst, and separated heaven and earth from each other, and reduced all things to order.”¹

“Let there be a firmament.” “Firmament,” in the Hebrew “expansion,” to which our “heaven²—that which is heaved or thrown up” (according to Horne Tooke), pretty nearly answers. Firmament corresponds with the word used by the Septuagint, *στερεωμα*, and expresses the meaning which the Alexandrian translators attached to the heaven of Moses and, I think, the meaning of

⁷ So Belus is represented by Berossus, *μεσον τεμοντα το σκοτος*.—Cory’s Ancient Fragments, p. 25.

⁸ “Qui a donné aux ténèbres la lumière protectrice? Qui a donné à la terre le sommeil pour protection? à l’esclave *la nuit* pour guide? trois choses qui sont *célestes* et grandes.” In a note to this passage of the Zend, Anquetil observes, “La nuit a paru après la guerre des dieux avec les Izeds, mais elle ne vient pas du mauvais prin-

cipe, puisqu’elle est céleste.”—Zend. vol. ii, p. 190, Ha 43.

⁹ Vide note ¹, p. 1.

¹ Τον δε Βηλον ὃν Δια μεθερμηνευουσι, μεσον τεμοντα το σκοτος χωρισαι γην και ουρανον απ’ αλληλων, και διαταξαι τον κοσμον. Cory, ut supra. Anaxagoras has the same notion: *παντα χρηματα ην ὁμοῦ, εἰτα νοις ελθων αὐτα διεκοσμησε*.

² In Hebrew “Samaim,” which Bochart (Canaan lib. ii, c. ii.) translates “heights.”

Moses himself. For the expanse not merely divides, but sustains the waters, and when rain is about to be poured down upon the earth, the windows, or floodgates of heaven, are said to be opened. This day God does not ratify his work with the usual formula, "God saw that it was good."

Third day (v. 9. 13.) A second time the waters are gathered together into one place;³ and the earth then first appears, naked and barren, but to be immediately covered with herbs, trees, and flowers, to all of which God gives, it will be observed, a productive power; they are herbs yielding seed, and trees yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself. This day twice the voice of God is heard expressive of his will, and twice God looks upon his work, and sets upon it the seal of his approbation.

Fourth day (v. 14). They who admit the possibility of a chaos, may argue that that chaos was to the after universe, as the first lights to these lights of heaven.

But how, up to this time, did the world exist in its place? Must we suppose that, like some unskilful workman, God made first this earth, and then the sun on which this earth depends? That without laws, or subject to other laws than those which now regulate its existence, he drove forth our planet, either to wander or stand motionless in the abyss of space? Or, basing our conjectures on the several offices assigned to the lights of heaven, shall we not rather say that Moses composed his creation according to theories of the solar system which obtained indeed in his day, but which are now altogether exploded? For Earth's sake order is given to chaos; for her service, and her service

³ Hence the expressions so common in Scripture, "Stretched out the heavens;" as in Job ix. 8, and "stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in," Isai. xl, &c. And in the Apocryphal book of

Enoch, chap. liii, "All the waters which are in the heavens and above them shall be mixed together."

⁴ According to the Zend, "The earth floats upon the water:" "Le monde, est sur l'eau."—Vendidad Sadi. Farg. xiii, vol. i, p. 386.

only—for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years, —sun, moon,⁵ and stars are set in the heavens; they are there but as choral nymphs in her train, among whom she moves, distinguishable by her size and beauty; they are there but to wait upon her pleasure, and to do her honour, and to accomplish her loveliness. But for her they had never been created. The earth, in a word, is the centre of Moses' system; it is more, it is his whole system. For those great worlds, whose number and whose immensity startle the human reason, are in his eyes, smaller than Peloponnesus⁶ even; they are but gigantic lamps⁷ hung in the heaven to light the world. Hence the otherwise unaccountable order which he has observed in his creation.

God this day ratifies his work.

Fifth day (v. 20-25.) The fowls of the air and the fish of the sea are created. *Both these* the water brings forth; *the fish are produced by* the waters which are under, and *the fowl*, most probably by the waters which are above, the firmament. *Both*, as afterwards the beasts of the field and creeping things, are thus natives of that element which they are supposed most especially to inhabit.

God this day not merely looks with approbation on His work, He also blesses it. "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the sea; and let the fowl multiply in the air." The laws of their nature are the blessings which God

⁵ The author of this hymn sees but with the sensual eye, the eye of the great bulk of men. With him the moon, though a lesser light, is great comparatively with those specks of stars which cover the firmament.

⁶ Anaxagoras, first among the Greeks, dared to suggest that the sun was large as Peloponnesus (it has grown wonderfully since his time), and I doubt not but that his cotemporaries had much the same notion of the heavenly bodies that have children, for whom the sun

and the moon are round and large as the shield of Norval, and the stars somewhat like the spangles on his mother's robe.

⁷ We cannot help falling into the vice of conjecture. Because the sun, from its diminutive size, *was* considered insufficient of itself to produce day, light was first created, and then the sun afterwards given to rule and direct that light, "to rule the day and divide the day from the night." We may thus account for the anterior creation of light.

bestows on His creatures; they are the blessings which He here pronounces on the inhabitants of the sea and air: And these truly, are fruitful, and multiply, as though to be fruitful and to multiply were the sole end of their being. Indeed *some animals*, as the locust, live only till they have propagated their species, and then immediately perish; and *all* are remarkable either for their prolific powers or for their care in nurturing their offspring.

But if to be fruitful and to multiply be indeed to be blessed, are, then, those animals which are the most fruitful the most blessed? As a general rule, we shall find that fish are more prolific than birds or beasts; animals of inferior, than those of superior, organization, and the short-lived and the weaker than the long-lived and the stronger. The blessing consequently, unless we are of those who regard a fine and noble organization as the greatest of miseries, and the zoophite therefore as the happiest of created things, cannot be of fruitfulness absolutely, but of fruitfulness determined by the laws to which each animal is subject. And, as regards any animal of any species, its rapid increase is, no doubt, strong evidence of its well-being; it implies a soil and climate suited to its constitution and habits, abundance of room and food, and safety or protection from external dangers. But this increase has, it must be remembered, its limit, beyond which, unless arrested by the gentlest of all checks, a destroying enemy, (I presume migration impossible), it becomes not a blessing but a curse. Should, for instance, the food be abundant, but the space too narrow for its occupants, then the soil, however naturally healthy, becomes, so I have heard game-keepers express it, stenchèd or tainted; and as fevers in ill-aired jails or crowded barracks, so infectious diseases of one sort or another begin to rage among the animals, and the weak die, and the strong are weakened, and for a time incapacitated from propagating their species. Should, on the other hand, the space be large, but the food insufficient, then famine destroys the younger animals, and their putrid bodies corrupt the air and thus generate disease among the

half-starved and enfeebled survivors. When however the increase of the animal is kept in check by enemies that prey upon it, then the animals, which perish, perish, but without injury to those that survive. Hence, man is justified by the very laws of nature, of reason, and of humanity, in appropriating animals to his own use and regulating their increase.

Sixth day (v. 24, 25.) Earth at God's command has already brought forth trees and herbs; and out of earth God now creates beast, and cattle, and creeping thing; and God ratifies his work. Not here, however, closes the sixth day's labour. God proceeds to another creation; and he *now* not merely expresses his will, but, as if to mark the nobility and excellence of the creation, He takes counsel with himself. "Let us make man," &c.

"Let us make man." These words had been read and re-read, commented upon and re-commented upon, for nearly two thousand years, when Christian divines suddenly found in them an heretofore unsuspected meaning. The plural pronoun could, they argued, only allude to the plurality of persons in the one Godhead, the holy Trinity. The poor Jews, therefore, priests and prophets not excepted,^s

^s Clarke, however, in his commentary on the first verse of Genesis, asserts, "that the Christians are not singular in receiving the doctrines of the Trinity, and in deriving it from the first words of Revelation. An eminent Jewish Rabbi, Simeon Ben Joachi, in his comment on the sixth section of Leviticus, has these remarkable words: 'Come and see the mystery of the word Elohim; there are *three degrees*, and each degree by itself *alone*, and not notwithstanding they are all *one*, and *joined together in one*, and are not divided from each other.' These are certainly extraordinary words; but before it is possible to ascertain their meaning, one must know what precedes and follows them; whether they refer to the being

Elohim, or to the mere word Elohim; and whether the whole passage is not founded on some etymological subtlety in which the Rabbins delighted. And after all this, it will be still necessary to enquire whether the Rabbi Ben Joachi was pure Jew, at what time he lived and where, and whether he was not likely to have been infected by the Platonic notions of the Alexandrian Jews. Not to mention that this passage has been considered a forgery (De Rossi Dizionario, vol. ii, p. 131), Wolfius (Bib. Heb.) supposes Jochai, or Jochaides, to have lived a.c. 120. He was one of the most celebrated, and the earliest writer, of the Cabalists. The views of the Cabalists, which will quite sufficiently account for the Rabbi's comments, may be found in Bas-

had lived and died ignorant of a revealed truth on which the salvation of a world depended.

Oh the Eleusinian mystery, the dark and subtle enigmen men would make of religion! The prophet of old, warmed with a divine love which pierced through the thick veil of ages, rapturously proclaimed that the path of God would in time become so plain, that even the wayfaring man should not err therein. After five and twenty centuries, we still inquire—that path, where is it? What riot, what tumult of men is this! What Babel of contention! I hear the harsh sounds of loud and coarse abuse and heart-felt invective, mixed up with smooth words of charity uttered in a voice of hate. A wrangling crew approaches. They boast themselves the servants and ambassadors of the most high God, and his appointed guides to the blissful path. They proffer us their services. And, as each one points to some little straggling bye-way of his own, he cries, “There! there! is the only and certain road to Heaven!” And then he presses to your ear and whispers, “See you that small, and chosen, and faithful band—join it: follow me, and Heaven and its joys are yours. Follow any other, and though I dare not judge, tremble, lest for you be reserved the unquenchable fire, and the worm that dieth not.” That little track, already crowded by that little band, the path to Heaven! God then have mercy on the great family of nations—mankind!

But who is so mad, that his common-sense rises not equally against both these promises and threats? All these would-be guides, thank God! cannot be right: why may not they all err? Examine their narrow paths, and you will find that though they are all carefully separated one from the other by painted canvass, or sculptured walls, or the more fearful idols of harsh dogmas and intolerant opinions, they are all cut out of the same great common.⁹ Look now at those who travel on them. The

nage Hist. des Juifs, lib. iii, c. x, p. 771. 783-787, and c. xiii, p. 803. This particular point of the Trinity is fully considered Ibid. lib. iv, c. v.

⁹ “Via ejus lata et expansa est,” says the Oupnekhat (xxxvii, 150; Brahme ii, p. 309)—though probably because “a few only amongst

simple-minded man, whichever his road be, walks on with joyous heart and head erect, and walks straight onward to the mansions of the just. Those, however, who merely busy themselves with the partition-walls with which they would enclose their path—building them up where they have been thrown down, and strengthening them where they have fallen into decay,—find their way dark with mists, haunted by erring lights and full of pitfalls. *They* seem to joy in the terrors of others, only because they themselves are in the hands of the giant Despair, or struggling in the Slough of Despond.

“The man then is every thing, the path nothing.”—What! is not the man much formed by his creed? Is it nothing to have low notions of God; to see in the Deity a Being terrible by His power and exacting impossible service? Is it nothing to look on man as a creature so steeped in sin, so naturally weak, that he who once wore God’s image is now incapable of goodness; that it is his curse that he was not born one of the beasts that perish? Is it nothing to have one’s greatness crushed and all one’s littleness fostered by the littleness of one’s creed? Nevertheless, break down the partition walls,—tear out from all these creeds their exclusiveness—leave man to have influence on man, creed on creed, and all errors will soon be amended. Men will still have creeds, but purified, enlarged: they will not any longer shudder away from the large spirit of Humanity: if it be not in their lesson, they will put it there: they will have faith in man, because they have faith in God.

“Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. . .so God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them.” What is the likeness here alluded to? Does not the forming

ten thousand mortals strive for perfection, and but few of those who strive and become perfect know God according to his nature;” (Bhagavat, les. vi.)—in the 151 Brahme we are told that “Obti-

nere gradum magnum entis valde difficile et subtile est.” Why so difficult, is however explained afterwards, according to the most approved jargon of Brahminical mysticism. I love however to cull

man of the dust of the ground in the *second*,¹ answer to the image of this, *the first*, chapter—naturally answer to it, if we bring to the question no preconceived opinions? Does not the very term “image”² itself imply a resemblance in outward form and lineaments; more especially when it is taken in connection with the sexual distinction “male and female created He them,” which is so immediately applied to the created man? Is it not then man’s body which bears his Maker’s image?

But how, it will be asked, could the corporeal man be formed in the image of the incorporeal God? The real question is, was this possible in the eyes of Moses? In *Genesis*, God is represented as working by day, and resting by night; and in the cool of the day, we find Him, like some eastern prince, walking in His garden. He enters into the business of life: He interrogates and judges Adam, and He makes coats of skins for him. He has human passions and affections; He rejoices in the sweet savour of sacrifice, and partakes of the hospitality of Abraham, &c. In *Exodus*, He descends on Sinai, and there He calls Moses into his immediate presence, while He sets bounds about the mountain, lest the people should break through, and come unto the Lord (c. xix.) And at Moses’

out a human thought wherever I find one.

¹ Viewed as a whole, one chapter explains the other. But because we so view them *now*, we are not precluded from afterwards examining and reviewing each chapter separately, and even contrasting them.

² It seems, however, that the Hindoos use the word to denote the resemblance between the soul and the Supreme Being. “Our souls,” says Wilford, “are, according to the Vedantas, no more than *murti*, images, or *ειδωλα* of the Supreme Spirit.” And the word “*murti* or form,” he explains, “is exactly synonymous with *ειδωλον*, and in a secondary sense means

“image;” but in its primary acceptation it denotes any shape or appearance assumed by a celestial being.”—*Asiatic Researches*, On the Nile, vol. iii, p. 359. He adds afterwards “that the sun, the stars, the earth, and the powers of nature are considered as *murtis* or images, the same in kind as ourselves, but transcendently higher in degree.” The particular sense given by the Hindoos to the *murti*, we must connect with their Pantheistic doctrines, and their notions of creation by emanation; which doctrines, &c. not existing in the Jewish faith, render the use of the word “image” in the same sense almost impossible.

request He shows himself to Moses, though not indeed in his glory.³ (c. xxxiii). But why multiply instances? Throughout the works of Moses, God is spoken of as dwelling in one particular spot;⁴ and if God be in one place rather than another, then God is not infinite in substance; He has limits,—consequently a form, and of that form, as He possesses none but human attributes, our body may fairly enough be considered a resemblance.

Because, however, we assign a form or figure to the God of Moses, we do not therefore conclude, that He was, in the Jewish conception of Him, a merely material⁵ God. The deities of Homer and Hesiod mix with men, and love and are loved of them; they see, hear, and feel by means of the same organs as ourselves; they wear our shape; and, feeding on nectar and ambrosia, they, like us, require sustenance; yet, human as they are, they are not altogether human. Ichor, not blood, flows in their veins; their bodies too are of a subtler texture than ours, they are literally what Hobbes asserts metaphysicians to have defined the soul, “bodiless bodies.”⁶ Similar, though

³ Who is not here reminded of the tale of Jupiter and Semele?

⁴ Over the holy of holies. When Herodotus tells us that the Persians had no images, and that they built no altars nor temples to their gods, he adds as a reason, “*ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρώποφύεας ἐνομίσαν τοὺς θεοὺς, καθάπερ οἱ Ἕλληνες.*” (i. 31), a reason which at any rate proves that among the Greeks, altars and temples were intimately connected with the anthropomorphism of the gods.

⁵ I would liken the Jewish views of the Deity to the Mahommedan. The Koran always attributes omniscience and omnipotence to God, the creator of heaven and earth (vide Koran, by Sale, c. lxx). But take its description of the day of judgment.—Allah sits on his angel-supported throne (vide Prelim. Dis. p. 110), with Mahommed by his

side as intercessor for mankind; before Him are placed, both that great book which contains his decrees, and also those other volumes in which guardian angels are incessantly engaged in *distinctly* writing down all our actions; according to our works testified in these books he proceeds to judge us, and, as the good or evil prevails, sends us to heaven or to hell. (c. lxxxix, &c.) But is all this, I would ask, compatible with the idea of a spiritual Deity?

⁶ The argument of the Epicurean Velleius, in Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*, will prove that the conceptions of God which I ascribe to Moses and the Jews, were not in the eyes of the old world quite so absurd as in ours. Common consent, argues Velleius, gives to the gods a human form, and in that form they have ever shown themselves to

more simple and more exalted, were the Jewish conceptions of God. He had shape⁷ without being of earth, and senses, though no fleshly body. He was spirit even: but spirit in these early times was but an extraordinary refinement, the volatile essence, of matter;⁸ and hence God is not ordinarily visible, though he occasionally deigns to show himself, to mortal eyes.⁹

But it may be objected to me,

1st. That as the passages already adduced, and the many others which may be adduced, from Moses, giving an anthropomorphic character to the Deity, are all of them easily resolvable into metaphors, they will not bear me out in my conclusions. True; but so to resolve, so to interpret them, is, it seems to me, to confound together the modes of thought and expression of different and distant ages, and to give the clear and definite opinions of an advanced state of society to an untutored and uncivilized

man; besides, man's form is the most beautiful; it must therefore be that of the gods, and he adds, "Quoniamque deos beatissimos esse constat, beatos autem esse sine virtute nemo potest, nec virtus sine ratione constare, nec ratio usquam inesse nisi in hominis figura: hominis esse specie deos confitendum est . . . Nec tamen ea species corpus est, sed quasi corpus, &c."—Lib. i. § xviii.

⁷ And this notwithstanding the assertion in Deut. iv. 15; which is contained, it will be observed, in a parenthesis, and which has to my simple mind all the appearance of an interpolation. Compare Exod. xxiv. 9, 10, 11.

⁸ Such, in the Persian faith, are the Ferouers, the spiritual inhabitants of the pure world, of whom we are the degraded semblances (vide Zend. note⁶, p. 83, vol. i, and Jescht Farvardin); and such the soul of the Hindus, which "assumes a luminous form with no gross body, with no perforation, with no

veins, no tendons; unblemished, untainted by sin, itself being a ray from the infinite spirit." (From Isavasyam, ver. 8, in Sir W. Jones' Works, vol. xiii, p. 375. See also Colebrooke's Essays, vol. i, p. 236); and such the gods of the Boodhists, who "have neither flesh, nor arms, nor bodies possessing any degree of consistency, though apparently with hair on their heads and teeth in their mouths; and their skins are impregnated with the most luminous and brilliant qualities." (Of Ceylon, Asiatic Researches, vol. vii, p. 35). If these and other creeds, however, sought to spiritualize matter, the Egyptian priests, according to Emeric-David, materialized spirit: "Aux yeux des prêtres de Memphis, tout dans la nature était vivant, intelligent, doué de raison, et tout cependant pure matière."—Recherches sur Jupiter, vol. i, p. 29.

⁹ Vide Exodus xxxiii; 2 Kings xxii. 19; Isaiah vi. 1.

people. For infant, barbarous man, there are no metaphors; he understands not the legerdemain of words; he never says to himself, all these passions and affections which the priest ascribes to the Deity, are but intended to express the interest which God takes in me and in my people; it is all seeming. No, he knows not *seems*: for him the thing *is*. Like Partridge at the theatre, the play which is *in our eyes* a play and nothing more, is *in his*, strong reality. He speaks sensuously,—not to startle, not to be picturesque, not for the sake of effect—but because he thinks and understands sensuously.

2nd. That if Moses had conceived that it was man's body which bore the image of the Creator, he would not so decidedly have forbidden the worship of graven images, seeing that such images might then have represented the supreme God. Yes; but if Moses conceived that images were incompatible with the worship of *one God*, would he not have forbidden them? Multiplied throughout the country, the Deity would have become localized¹ through them in many places: to particular images a particular efficacy would have been attributed: the unity and simplicity of the religion would thus have been destroyed, and the very existence, as a nation, of the people for whom Moses legislated would have been perilled. For, each tribe, each town, would have set up and consecrated its own image, and would have claimed for it the high honour of being the especial dwelling-place of God. The ark, and afterwards the temple, would soon have ceased to be the banners and the rallying points of the whole nation. Their religion, instead of uniting the several tribes, would have been as a firebrand among them, an ever fertile source of hatred and contention. Instead of one rival, Gerizim, one natural enemy, Zion had had twelve; and instead of

¹ "It appears," says the English editor of Calmet, in *Scripture Illustrated*, "from numerous instances, that the services of divine worship under the Mosaic dispensation, resembled those usually addressed to monarchs among oriental nations; and there is little that the Hebrews addressed themselves to a person *understood to be resident in the sanctuary*."—Of Ancient Censors.

holding their own some centuries, and thus gaining time to develop the spiritual life which lay under and among the piles of earth that covered them, the Jews, divided among themselves and surrounded by enemies, would most probably never have attained to the rank of a nation; they would have been lost among their more powerful neighbours, and all trace and memory of them would long since have perished from the earth.

(Ver. 28.) God's first words to man are words of blessing. He limits man's duties by his pleasures. Those pleasures, however, are purely temporal, and

1st. Animal. They are sexual, but sexual limited by the ends for which the sexes were created: "Be fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth."

2nd. Of dominion. "Subdue the earth, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the face of the earth." Man bows to God, and the brute creation bows to man. Over all living things, man, by God's patent, is created the natural lord; but the earth is given him conditionally,—he must subdue it; by his efforts and labour alone shall it become subject to his will.

(Ver. 29.) God, as if continuing His blessing, gives to man corn and fruit for food, and to the beast of the field He allots the green herb. No carnivorous animals then had been yet called into existence. Lions and tigers, whose teeth and jaws unfit them for pasturage, could not have been yet created; for, grant that Nature has been ever consistent with herself, to suppose them with other teeth and jaws is to suppose them, as comparative anatomy shows us, with other limbs and another confirmation of body, *i. e.* is to suppose them something else than lions and tigers.²

² Yet in the reign of the Messiah, during which, as in the reign of Sosiosh of the Persian creed, earth will again become an Eden, and man probably return to his pristine food: we are told by the prophet, "That the wolf shall dwell with the

lamb, and the leopard lie down with the kid, and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them; and the cow and the bear shall feed, and their young ones shall lie down together, and the

With man, however, the case is different. According to Cuvier, he seems to have been destined to feed principally on fruits, and the roots and succulent parts of vegetables; his hands enable him to gather or tear them up with facility, and his short and rather feeble jaws on the one side, and the shape of his canine and molar teeth on the other, scarcely permit him to pasture on grass or to devour flesh until prepared by fire; but the instant that he becomes acquainted with fire and its uses, and that he has acquired the skill to seize, or at a distance to kill, other animals, then all living creatures serve for his nourishment, and enable him infinitely to multiply his species. Not improbable, therefore, is it that man's first food was, as Moses shows us, of fruit and vegetables.³ God, this sixth day, overlooks all His work, and, "behold it was very good."

Seventh day (ii. 1-3.) God rests from his labour and blesses the seventh-day and sanctifies it. "Sanctifies it"—but how? The fourth commandment (Exodus xx.) refers exclusively to the Sabbath and the manner in which it should be observed. On this day, the Israelite must "not do any work, nor his son, nor his daughter, nor his manservant, nor his maid-servant, nor his cattle, nor the stranger within his gates;" and consequently, on this day, the people, *while yet in the desert*, are forbidden to collect manna, or to light fires, or to gather wood;⁴ and *afterwards, in Jerusalem*, on this day no victuals can be sold; through the city-gates no burden is permitted to pass, and about the walls no merchant of Tyre, no asses laden with wine, or grapes, or figs, are suffered to lodge: for "the Lord hath hallowed the Sabbath, to do no work therein."⁵

lion shall eat straw like the ox; and the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child put his hand on the cockatrice' den."—Isai. xi. 6-8. Vide some observations on this passage, opposed to the arguments I have used, in *Nimrod*, vol. iv, p. 150.

³ So also Diodorus Siculus, vol. i, b. i, § viii, p. 21, Bipont.

⁴ Exodus xvi. 22. 24; Numbers xv. 32, 33; and Juvenal:—"Septima quæque fuit lux Ignava, et partem vitæ non attigit ullam."—Sat. xiv, 105.

⁵ Nehemiah xiii. 19; Jeremiah xvii. 24.

On this day, then, the business of life was at a stand. The day was hallowed by rest. Rest from labour was all that the law⁶ required from the Israelites, as a nation, on the Sabbath.

But are we then to conclude that the people of Israel celebrated "the world's birth-day"⁷ by devoting it to mere rest from labour, to indolence, to a longer sleep? From 2 Kings iv. 23, we may gather, that it was customary on the Sabbath to visit some priest, prophet, or holy man, no doubt for instruction and exhortation in the duties of religion. And from the chap. xvi. v. 17, of the same book, it would seem as though "a covert," or hall, or cloister, had been built and set apart for those, who frequented the temple on that day. *A portion* of the Sabbath, then, was *not improbably* devoted, even in the early periods of Jewish history, as *it certainly was* in the later times of Christ, to religious observances; and *the remainder* was spent, *by the better part of the community at least*, "in a festal⁸ cheerfulness," in receiving and returning the visits

⁶ In the 58th chapter of Isaiah perhaps, the Sabbath is alluded to, as requiring something more than this. But Philo, quoted by Spenser (De Leg. Heb.), speaks of it as bringing rest even to tree and flower; and, in the *Espion Turc*, is a Jewish legend respecting it, quite in the Rabbinical taste: "Les Juifs parlent d'une rivière d'Orient, qui demeure immobile le septième jour de la semaine, ce qu'ils regardent comme une confirmation de leur loi. Ils disent aussi que ce jour-là, les satyres et autres monstres du désert évitent la lumière du soleil, et se cachent dans les cavernes de la terre, où ils maudissent le Sabbath parce qu'il surprend Dieu avant qu'il eut achevé à donner la dernière main à leur forme, &c."—Vol. iii, p. 11.

⁷ Την του κοσμου γενεθλιον ημεραν.—Philo.

⁸ "Judæi veteres otium sabbati-

cum, non solummodo pietatis officiis impenderunt. Eos enim die Sabbati (saltem postquam synagogæ vel templi sacris adfuissent) epulis, choreis, ludis, compotationibus et exercitiis juvenilibus se ipsos oblectare solitos, multis veterum testimoniis, a Sherlogo et Heylano nostro congestis, abunde confirmatum est. Fatetur ipse Philo: *Mosen æquum censuisse, ut sabbatum celebrarent otio; et εν ιλαριαις ευθυμαις, festis hilaritatibus*. Augustinus asserens Judæos Sabbatum coluisse tantum *ad luxuriam et ebrietatem*, eosque quiescere solummodo ad nugas et luxurias suas, quod diem illum languido et luxurioso otio consumerent, eoque non solum deliciis Judaicis, sed ad nequitiam abuterentur."—Spenser, De Leg. Heb. lib. i, c. v, p. 79. Nevertheless an opinion obtained among the Romans, that the Jews fasted on their

of friends, in feasts,⁹ and dances, and games, and juvenile exercises; while *by the more sensual* it was wasted in idleness, and luxury, and drunkenness, in the commission of all those crimes to which idleness is the certain passport.

In reviewing this creation we are struck:

I. By its division into days.

These days, though several of them are undetermined by any revolution of the earth round the sun,¹ were nevertheless, I presume, meant, and understood to be natural days of twenty-four hours each. Some commentators, however, have taken another view of them; and of late,¹ Faber, anxious to reconcile Moses with the geologists, argues, that, as these days are homogenous; and as the term *day*, in Hebrew, is often used for any indefinite time, and cannot in this chapter mean a natural day, or a revolution of the earth; and as, moreover, the seventh day is not yet ended, because no new creation has yet taken place;² that, therefore, each day measures a space of at least six thousand years. To this argument there seem to me two objections—

1st. That the assumption that God, since the creation of this earth, or of our system, has ceased to work, is scarcely reconcilable with any rational apprehension of the Deity; and is moreover contrary to the sense of Scripture (Psalm civ. 31; Isaiah xlv, 7; John v. 17); and contrary to the theological views of infant man, whose deities are ever too busy, too personally active; and ever engaged, if not in creating, in mending and rectifying their handywork.

sabbaths. "Ne Judæus quidem, mi Tiberi," says Augustus in a letter to Tiberius, "tam diligenter Sabbatis jejuniū servat, quam ego hodie servavi."—Suetonius, August. § 76; and read Casaubon, a. h. l.; see also Persius, Sat. v. 184; and compare Juvenal, vi, 158; Judith, viii, 5, 6; and x, 2, 3.

⁹ Luke xiv. 1, 7.

¹ I have just met with this argument of Faber's stated in *Nimrod*,

vol. iv, p. 152, but its tendencies are, it seems to me, misunderstood—if indeed I may speak of the tendencies of a work which it is now many years since I have read.

² This is clearly the Mahomedan doctrine. "It is God," says the Koran, "who hath created the heavens and the earth, and whatever is between them; and then ascended his throne."—c. xxxii.

And 2dly. That though "day" may be often used for any indefinite time, it surely never is so, when particularized, as it always is in the creation, as morning and evening.³

II. By the manner in which the work of each day is distributed throughout the day.

Generally each day represents a volition of the Creator; a creation; and a retrospect by the Deity of that creation. The exceptions are:

1st. The second day: on which day alone God does not look back on his work and declare his pleasure in it.

2dly. The third day: which contains two distinct volitions

³ According to the Chinese creation, heaven and earth were perfected in three hours. Chou-king, by De Guignes, Dis. Prelim. c. i, p. 10. To these hours, however, an interpretation, similar to Faber's of the Mosaical days, has been given by later commentators. I will quote the passages: "Il y a une ancienne tradition qui porte que le ciel fut ouvert à l'heure Tse, que le terre parut à l'heure Tcheou, et que l'homme naquit à l'heure Yu. Ces trois heures, par rapport à un jour, comprennent le tems qui coule depuis onze heures de la nuit jusqu'à cinq heures du matin."—Chou-king, p. 10. "Hou-chi dit, avant toutes choses il y a eu le ciel; la terre fut formée ensuite; et après la terre l'homme fut produit par les différens combinaisons que les vapeurs les plus subtiles prirent entre elles. Le ciel commença ces opérations à la révolution du Rat, la terre les siennes à celle du Bœuf, et l'homme fut produit à la révolution du Tigre." Chao-tse dit: "Depuis le moment où le ciel et la terre ont été en mouvement, jusqu'à celui où ils finiront, il doit y avoir une révolution entière. Une révolution contient douze périodes, et la période est composée de 10,800 ans." The

same author then goes on to assert, that a space of 10,800 years took place between each creation.

Similarly in the Persian cosmogony. Hyde informs us: "*Loco ejus quod nos Hexaemeron vocamus, veteres Persæ credunt Deum creasse mundum in sex temporibus, quæ etiam vocantur ἑξαχρονον, respiciendo ad sex dies quæ, in libris cœlestibus seu bibliis sacris, memorantur; idque faciunt ex regula quæ in Libris Zend exarata est; viz. putantes in tam grandi opere diem esse pro collectione dierum.*"—De Rel. Vet. Pers. c. ix, p. 164. In page 166, id. we have a more specific account of these times. During the first of 45 days, the heavens were created; during the second of 60, the waters; in the third of 75, the earth; in the fourth of 30, the trees; in the fifth of 80, all creatures; in the sixth of 75, man. (Compare Afrin du Gehanbar, Anquetil's Zend. vol. ii, p. 81.) In the Boun-Dehesch, however, we are told that the creation occupied 6000 years, and will endure 6000 more. With this last creation, as evidently borrowed from it, compare the cosmogony of the Tyrrhenians from Suidas, v. Tyrrhenia; also in Cory's Ancient Fragments, p. 319.

of God, and two creations; one of the earth, and another of grass, and herbs, and trees: and two ratifications, one of each of this day's works.

3dly. The fifth day, which besides a volition, creation, and ratification of that creation, contains also a blessing, which God pronounces on the creatures He has just made.

And 4thly. The sixth day, which, like the third, has two distinct volitions, and two creations, and two ratifications, *one* of the first of that day's works, *a second* of the whole creation. This day is also distinguished from all the rest, by the manner in which the Deity pauses ere He creates man, and by the large blessing which He pronounces upon him.

III. By the order of the creation.

The creation may be divided into two parts of three days each. The first begins, as preparatory to the creation of the world, by dissipating the darkness that brooded over and formed a part of the chaotic mass; that mass it then proceeds to drain of its superfluous water, which it describes as gathered up into Heaven: the seas are then formed, and the dry land appears, and is immediately covered over with verdure. So far the work is perfect. A world, over which a gentle light is diffused, rests under a blue heaven; seas roll their waters on the shore, flowers bloom, trees wave their leafy branches, and the grass wears the beauty of spring, even as now. But the Deity stays not here. The earth is but a stage, on which living beings are to play a part, and God therefore proceeds to the second act of creation. *As the first* was ushered in by the creation of light,—the light necessary to the world and its vegetable productions; *so the second* commences with those lights of Heaven, which are considered *here* as more especially useful to man; and *as* water and air were before earth, *so* are they now first filled, the one with fish and the other with birds; the earth is then called upon to produce its living creatures; and man is last of all created the crown and lord of creation, the image of the Creator, His master-piece, the last and sublimest effort of His skill.

IV. By the details of the creation.

And 1st. They are such as to prevent idolatry. Thus light is created as light merely, and the Persian Ormuzd is no god; the world is created a soul-less mass, and Kneph of the Egyptian triad never had existence; sun, moon, and stars are created the measures of time, and the Sabæan deities are vain idols; the productive powers of animals are given to them by God, and the Israelite cannot bow before the gross emblems⁴ of eastern superstition. Nay, more, in this his cosmogony, Moses so distinctly places man before our eyes as the centre of all creation, as something so much more and greater than all other created things, that for him to worship any or all of them, is for him to degrade himself below his servants, and to swear fealty to his own vassals.

2dly. They are such as to prepare us for any sudden changes in the established course of Nature. As man is the centre of creation, as for him all things were made, and as into his hands all things are delivered, to conduce to his comfort and happiness, we can never feel surprised, if for his sake the laws of Nature should hereafter be subverted.

3dly. They are such as to prepare the way for those distinctions of meats, which make up so large a part of the Mosaical and other eastern creeds. A particular food is set apart for man. He may eat of herbs bearing seed, and of the fruit of trees, but, by a fair inference he may not eat flesh. In the superstitions of Egypt, Persia and India, various meats are for various reasons unlawful.⁵ In the Jewish, they are unlawful because unclean; and they are unclean because they have been declared so by God. Even therefore in that account of the creation which

⁴ See Asiatic Researches, vol. iii, p. 338.

⁵ In India, on account of the doctrine of Metempsychosis, because "the soul of our grandam

may possibly inhabit a bird;" in Persia, because all unclean animals are the creation of Ahriman, the evil one; and in Egypt, for sanitary reasons.

opens the Hebrew books, it is no matter of surprise for us to find the Elohim already making known to man what he may, and by implication what he may not, eat. As the lord of creatures, man has rule and dominion; as the servant and steward of God, he must learn from his birth to obey.

4thly. They allude to those divisions of time, which occupied so much of the attention of the olden nations. These are,

First, the *Natural*: ascertained by the mutations of the sun and moon; those great dial plates of Heaven, which the Elohim created "to be for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years."

And secondly, the *Sacred*: determined by the periodical celebration of some particular event, *e. g.*, of the creation; to the memory of which as "the world's birthday," each seventh day, thus inducing necessarily a division of time into weeks, is dedicated.

The *Natural* divisions of time—dependent on phenomena universally regular, and so singularly striking that they arrest the attention even of the most sottish and degraded,—are, without any surprise, found every where the same, or nearly the same; and are every where, too, along with the other cardinal inventions of early civilization, ascribed by all people to either their gods or first legislators. Thus the Egyptians, taught by Theath,⁶ had a year of twelve months of thirty days each, which, with five intercalary days, gave them a year of three hundred and sixty-five days.⁷ The Persian year was exactly⁸ similar; with these, in the number of its days and intercalary days, the old Mexican year agreed; but instead of twelve, it had eighteen months,⁹ each of twenty days. The Chinese¹ year is of three hundred and sixty-six days.

⁶ Marsham Canon. Chron. p. 37.

⁷ Herod. B. ii, c. iv.

⁸ Hyde, De Rel. Vet. Pers. p. 169.

⁹ De Solis, Conquest of Mexico, b. iii, c. xvii, vol. i, p. 433.

¹ Yao (the first Emperor of China) dit: "Vous, Hi et Ho, vous aurez soin que l'année soit de trois cent soixante-six jours."—Mémoires Chinoises, vol. i, p. 172.

The Greek² was of twelve lunar months, of thirty days each, "with intercalated years, which reduced all to the solar form."³ Similarly, the Jewish year was lunar, but "like the Greeks, the Jews were necessitated by their festivals to fling in an intercalary month whenever their year fell short of the seasons."⁴

With regard now to the other division of time, *the Sacred*: it clearly differs from the *Natural*, in that it depends on events which can only be known by tradition, and not on universal facts, which "all who run may read." It is then an accidental and arbitrary division of time, and one that will, in all probability, obtain only among nations which have a common origin, or a common religion, or which derive their customs from a common source. But the division of time into weeks, the first sacred division of time upon record, and one instituted by God himself, and coeval with the creation, has been boasted of by later writers⁵ as a custom of universal observance. And, in truth, it has established itself in the empire of China,⁶ over Europe, a large portion of Asia and America, and the more populous parts of Africa,⁷ wherever, in a word, the names of Christ and Mahomet are held in honour. Whence then this universality?

In the old Roman Calendar, the months were divided into calends, nones, and ides;⁸ in the Greek, into three

² For the fabled inventors of the Greek year, see Potter's *Antiquities of Greece*, c. ii, vol. xxvi.

³ Vide Prideaux, *Connection*, B. v, c. vi, vol. i, p. 341.

⁴ *Id. id.*

⁵ Witsius *Ægyptiaca*, lib. iii, c. ix, § ii.

⁶ "Les Chinois divisent leur semaines comme nous, suivant l'ordre des planètes; le soleil et la lune sont les deux premiers. Quant aux autres, les Chinois leur ont donné les noms de leur cinq éléments, qui sont la terre, le feu, l'eau, le bois et les métaux; la terre ils

ont appliquée à Saturne, le bois à Jupiter, le feu à Mars, le métal à Venus, et l'eau à Mercure."—*Mem. Chinoises*, vol. v, p. 44.

⁷ Even on the Gold Coast, but derived from Europeans: "Quoi-que les nègres n'aient pas d'autre notion de l'année et de sa division en mois et en semaines, que celle qu'ils tirent de la fréquentation des Européens, &c." (*Hist. Gen. des Voy.* vol. iv, p. 167.) "Ils divisent le tems en partis heureuses et malheureuses."—*Ibid.* The true barbaric division.

⁸ Adams's *Roman Antiquities*,

decads of days; in the Persian, into four parts,⁹ two of which contained seven, and two eight days each: and in the Mexican year the weeks were of thirteen days.¹ The septenary cycle, as in general use, is therefore of comparatively modern date; nevertheless, so early as the age of Josephus,² it prevailed throughout the Roman Empire, though it does not seem to have been introduced into the calendar till the reign of Theodosius.³ Whence then was it borrowed?

Besides the Jews, the Egyptians are the only people among whom this cycle obtained, who press forward any claims to its invention.⁴ Now it seems that the civilized world, when it first adopted the measure of weeks, adopted also the Egyptian⁵ names of the days. From Egypt, as

On the Roman Year, p. 304; and for the manner in which the *nundinæ* were observed at Rome, see Selden, De Jure Nat. lib. iii, c. xv.

⁹ Ut Græci olim septimanis destituti, *mensem trifariam in tres dierum decanos dividebant*, sic cum in *Vet. Pers.* mense non sint septimana, sicut sunt in mense Arabum, Persæ videntur tale quoddam parasse remedium interponendo nomen Dei, quod quadripartitam efficeret mensis divisionem, quæ septinariæ partitioni esset proxima." The first day of the month, we are then informed, is called Hormuzd; after seven days comes Deybadur, "seu Dey, Deus cum Adur, et eodem modo post alios septem dies venit Deybamihir seu Dey cum Mihir, et tum post octo dies Deybadin seu Dey cum Din, &c." The Persians, Hyde conjectures, were led to this division for convenience' sake: "Triginta dies non potuerunt aliter dividi quam per bis septenos et bis octenos dies."—Hyde, De Rel. Vet. Pers. c. xix, p. 239; and see further, c. xx, p. 260.

¹ "The Mexicans had their weeks

of thirteen days, with different names, which they marked in their calendar by images."—De Solis, ut supra.

² According to Selden, De Jure Nat. B. iii, c. xix; and see note ³, p. 38, infra.

³ Scaliger, De Emendat. Temp. B. iv, p. 219.

⁴ Merely in so far as Europeans have copied from them. In China the week is probably original. For though China jars have been discovered in Egyptian tombs (vide Wilkinson's Egypt and the Egyptians, vol. iii, and Davis's China), they came there indirectly. They are like the English ware Denham and Clapperton found at the court of Timbuctoo; no evidence whatever of any interchange of thought and customs between the two people.

⁵ Herodotus, b. ii, c. lxxxii; Dio Cassius, B. xxxvi, p. 37: "Quod vero dies adsignantur septem stellis quæ planetæ vocantur, id certe est inventum Ægyptiorum."—From Witsius Ægypt. B. i, c. vi; see also Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, §. 40; compare, however, Casaubon ad Suetonium, Tiberius, § 32.

the Romans borrowed their year, so they also probably borrowed their week. But in Egypt, the ancestors of the Jews sojourned some four centuries, and from them the Egyptians may very possibly have acquired this measure of time. We will, therefore, inquire how far it was in use among the Patriarchs before Jacob's emigration into Egypt.

From the book of Genesis, we learn that a septenary cycle was possibly known to Noah,⁶ and certainly in use with Laban and his family.⁷ But, in this first chapter, that cycle is represented to us as subordinate to, and merely the consequence of, the Sabbath-day; as in fact owing its existence to the observance of that day; and yet throughout Genesis, with the exception of this creation—and what evidence have we that this creation was ever revealed to any other than Moses?—there is not the slightest allusion to any seventh, as a peculiarly holy, day. Not indeed, till after the Exodus⁸ is the *Sabbath* mentioned, and then its sanctity is pressed upon us in almost every verse, and its observance is ensured by the heaviest penalties; the very severity with which it is commanded, bespeaks it an innovation and no ancestral and well-established custom. In a word, we have no evidence whatever that the hebdomadal, as a constantly recurring cycle, as dividing and measuring the whole year, was known to the Hebrews before their settlement in Egypt. And we must conclude, therefore, that the weeks of Noah and of Laban were merely any seven days set apart for a festal or a religious purpose—perhaps, because the heptad, or number seven, was held in peculiar reverence; or, for some other reason which at this distance of time it would

⁶ Genesis viii. 10-12; and see *infra ad h. loc.*

⁷ Genesis xxix. 27

⁸ "Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness; and I gave them my statutes..... Moreover I gave them my sabbaths to be a sign between me and them."

—Ezek. xx. 10, 11, 12; and Deut. v. 3: "The Lord made *not* this covenant *with our father, but with us, even us;*" and this covenant is contained in the Decalogue. I know, however, that to these passages another sense may be given. If they do not prove my case, they give it at least probability.

be vain to speculate on, but which may as easily be drawn from many natural phenomena as from this first chapter of Genesis.

We will now examine the Egyptian week. . . . At a first glance we find that the Egyptian week is not a cycle of seven mere days, but of seven days, each one of which has its appropriate name, and a name, moreover, taken from the planet to which it is dedicated.⁹ Did not, then, for the Egyptians were a people devoted to astrology,¹ the number of the planets determine the number of their days? Or were they led to the division of their months into weeks, by the observation that the moon required *seven*² days from new moon to its first quarter, and *other seven days* to reach its full, and so on to its decline? And did they, then, finding that the planets were the same in number as the days, apply the names of the one to denote the other? I cannot determine which of these is the more probable reason for the Egyptian week; but I perceive that, as that week was associated with no events, hallowed by no traditions, it had no arbitrary origin, but was founded on an observation, never mind how crude, of the phenomena of Nature; and that therefore, like other natural divisions of time, it might be alike original in China, in Haran, and in Egypt.

If, however, it is necessary to decide between the pretensions of the Jews and those of the Egyptians, we must avow, that it seems to us just as probable, that the Jews,

⁹ Vide supra, note ⁵, p. 35.

¹ Their astronomical observations and attainments are highly prized by Diod. Sic. lib. i, c. lxxxi.

² In Stanley, Hist. Phil., though quoted indeed from later writers, I find among the doctrines of Pythagoras (who, like Moses, was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians), the following opinions concerning the Heptad: "Whatever is best among sensible things, by which the seasons of the year and their periods are orderly and complete,

participates of the hebdomad; *the moon having seven days measures all time.*"—Doctrine of Pythagoras, c. xiv, part ix. And in a note of Brotier, to Tacitus' conjectures on the origin of the Sabbath, the virtue of the Heptad is considered as an Egyptian as well as a Pythagorean superstition: "*Ea fuit Ægyptiorum ac Pythagoræorum ac postea astrologorum superstitio, ut mundi tempora hominumque fata septem siderum cursu regi crederent.*"—Hist. Taciti, note, lib. v, c. iv.

who show none but accidental or traditional reasons for the use of their cycle, should have borrowed it from the Egyptians, as it is improbable that the Egyptians, with whom it appears as a natural measure of time, should have acquired it from the Jews.

But if there be a natural reason for the septenary cycle, there is none for the observance of the seventh as a day of rest, a festival; yet is the Sabbath, so Jewish and Christian writers affirm,³ every where held in honour, and every where, by the confession of the nations themselves, celebrated as a day holy and especially dedicate to God.

That this hebdomadal feast was not altogether unknown to the *Romans*, Ovid, Seneca, Juvenal, Horace, and Tacitus⁴ are witnesses; but the very terms in which

³ See Huetius, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, prop. iv, c. xi, for the authorities: "Insignis est locus R. Gedaliae in Catena Cabalæ, quo in confesso apud Ethnicos ait, *universum orbem sabbathum celebrare*; insignis et ille Josephi:—*οὐδ' εστιν ου πολις ἑλληνων, ουδε τις ουν, ουδε βαρβαρος, ουδε ἐν εθνος, ενθα μη το*

του εβδομαδος, ἣν αργοῦμεν ἡμεῖς, το εθος ου διαπεφοιτηκεν: "Nulla omnino urbs est vel Græcorum, vel Barbarorum, neque ulla gens ad quam non penetraverit mos celebrandi septimi diei, quem feriati traducimus." See, however, Selden, *ut supra*, who gives another meaning to this passage of Josephus.

⁴ Ovid, *Art Amor.* :—

"Nec te prætereat Veneri ploratus Adonis
Cultaque Judæo septima sacro Lyro."

In the *Remedia Amoris*, Ovid applies the epithet "peregrina" to the Sabbath. Seneca, *Epist.* xcv. "Ac-

cendere aliquam lucernam Sabbatho prohibeamus, &c."—Juvenal, *xiv.* 96:—

"Quidam sortiti metuentem Sabbata patrem
Nil præter nubes, et cæli numen adorant,
Nec distare putant humana carne suillam,
Qua pater abstinnit; mox et præputia ponunt:
Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges
Judaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuant jus
Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses."

Horace, *Sermon.* i, 9, 7:—

—(*Fuscus*) "Hodie tricesima Sabbata: vin' tu
Curtis Judæis oppedere?" Nulla mihi inquam
Religio est. (*Fuscus*) "At mihi sum paulo infirmior, unus
Multorum."

Tacit. *Hist.* v. iv: "Septimo die otium placuisse, ferunt, quia is finem laborum tulerit, dein blande inerte inertia, septimum quoque an-

num ignaviae datum." See, however, Selden, *De Jure Nat.* lib. iii, c. xvii.

they mention it, as well as the silence of all antiquity on the subject, are evidence that it was no Roman festival. *Among the Greeks* the seventh day was sacred, even so early as the times of Homer and Hesiod. The Athenians more particularly celebrated it “*laurum gestantes, canistrum coronantes, hymnisque laudantes Deum.*” But this seventh, as Selden proves,⁵ was a monthly, and no week day. *In Egypt*, however, Marsham,⁶ whose mania it was to make every law and custom of Israel but a reflex or copy of something Egyptian, will have it that the Sabbath obtained:—

1st. Because the Egyptian priests always observed a septenary cycle in their purifications, never limiting them to less than seven, and sometimes extending them to forty-two days.

And 2dly. Because the seventh day, as dedicate to Saturn, (among astrologers a planet of melancholy and inauspicious aspect), was a black day, an unlucky day, one of those days (the *ἡμέραι αποφραδες* of the Greek calendar) on which no business whatever was transacted.

To these conjectural reasons we may object:

1st. That though, when viewed alone, each one may carry with it some air of probability, yet, when taken together, they are rather contradictory one of the other; and,

2dly. That while the second is quite unsupported by authority,⁷ the first merely proves a superstitious and mystical reverence for the heptad, the seven, but contains nothing which can lead us to the conclusion that in Egypt, every recurring seventh day was a day of rest, a holy day, a Sabbath.

In *Persia*, in *India*,⁸ in *China*, in *Mexico*, this “pandemic

⁵ Selden, ut supra.

⁶ Canon. Chron. Secul. ix, p. 109.

⁷ Witsius *Ægyptica* conf. lib. i, c. vi, et lib. iii, c. ix.

⁸ Nevertheless, among the sectaries of Siva, in the west of Meissour, the Monday in every week is observed in the same way as the Sunday with us.—Dubois, *Mœurs des*

Indes, vol. i, p. 9. That the septenary cycle, however, was unknown to the religion of ancient India, may be seen by the divisions of the civil year, given by Colebrook in *Asiatic Researches*, vol. v, p. 105, by Davis, *Id.* vol. ii, p. 230. In the White Yajur-veda, moreover, are noticed the divisions of time which

feast"⁹ is equally unknown: in short, in the words of Selden, "Apud ethnicorum longe potiorum partem diei septimanæ cessationem deridiculo fuisse, et (si paucos excipias) Judæos solos lucem septimam quiete transegisse."¹

But though the Sabbath day was unregarded, the Sabbath feasts, or feasts analogous to them, were observed by all the nations of antiquity. The savage on his return from a successful chase makes holiday, and prepares a plentiful banquet, and gorges himself with food, and then lays himself down to sleep, and wakes but to eat again, and then again to sleep, until his stock of provisions is exhausted, and hunger at length rouses him to fresh exertions. His life is divided between the severest toil and the most listless indolence. So soon, however, as men begin to live in societies, and have learned to tame and to keep cattle, and to cultivate the earth; so soon as they have some assured means of subsistence, we find their legislators regulating the alternations of labour and repose, *consecrating particular days* to rest,² and *hallowing these days* by dedicating them to the gods, and making them happy days for the people, by adorning them with feasts and games, and solemn sacrifice. Thus, among the Egyptians, according to Herodotus,³ there were many public festivals; he enumerates six of them, and though he describes the people as thronging to the cities in which they were more particularly celebrated, it is no rash conjecture to suppose that the days, on which they were held, were holidays throughout the land. In *Greece*,⁴ the days were of three

belong to the calendar of the Vedas. Fire is thus addressed: "Thou art the first year of the cycle, thou art the second year.....thou art the fifth year; may morning appertain to thee; may days, and nights, and *fortnights*, and *months*, and *seasons*, belong to thee."—*Asiatic Researches*, vol. viii, p. 434.

⁹ Philo Judæus. πανδημος ἑορτή. I here speak of it, not as a feast, but as a feast held on a particular day.

¹ Selden, De Jure Nat. vol. iii, c. xv.

² Κοινων τουτου και των Ἑλληνων και των βαρβαρων εστι, το τας ἱεροποιας μετ ανεσεως ἑορταστικης ποιεισθαι: "Commune hoc est et Græcis et barbaris sacra celebrare cum festa laborum intermissione."—Strabo, lib. x, p. 467. From Marsham Canon Chron. Sec. ix, p. 185.

³ B. ii, c. lviii.—lxiii.

⁴ Selden, ut supra, B. iii, c. xvi.

kinds, working days (*εργασίμοι*); black days (*αποφραδες*); and festal days (*ἐορτασίμοι*). "On most of these last days, the shops and courts of judicature were shut up. The labourers rested from their works, the tradesmen from their employments, the mourners intermitted their sorrows, and nothing but ease and pleasure, mirth and jollity, were to be found among them."⁵ *In Rome*, the days were similarly divided; every ninth day, *nundina*, was a holiday. And on holidays, *feriæ*, the citizen was expected to abstain from litigation and quarrels, and the slave from labour.⁶ *The Persians*, besides many other holidays, celebrated the five intercalary days (*dies appendices*), which completed their year, in joy and feasting.⁷ These same days, the Mexicans believed, "had been purposely left by their ancestors as days of vacation, and during this time they gave themselves up wholly to idleness, and only studied how to lose that overplus of time. Tradesmen left off work; the business of the tribunals ceased, and the very sacrifices in the temples."⁸ *In China*, the holidays were new and full moon.⁹ *In India*, there are certain prescribed days, on which the superstitious Hindoo dares not even clean his teeth.¹ Among the Boodhists of

⁵ From Potter's *Antiquities of Greece*, vol. i, book ii, c. xix.

⁶ Cicero, commenting on these words of an old law: "*Feriis jurgia amovento; easque in familiis, operibus patratis, habento*," observes: "*Feriarum festorumque dierum ratio in liberis quietem habet litium et jurgiorum; in servis operum et laborum, quia compositio anni conferre debet et ad perfectionem operum rusticorum et ad remissionem animorum*."—*De Legibus*, B. ii, cap. xii & vii. See also Columella, ii, 22, where what was, and what was not permitted on the *feriæ*, are more particularly enumerated.

⁷ Hyde, *De Rel. Vet. Pers.* p. 169, 193; and *Précis Rais*; vol. ii, p. 602 Zend: "Les Gehanbars se

célèbrent dans les tems de l'année qui répondent à ceux auxquels Ormuzd à l'origine du monde créa les êtres qui composent l'univers."—*L'Afrin du Gehanbar*, p. 814.

⁸ *De Solis, Conquest of Mexico*, ut supra. Scaliger seems to say that the thirteenth day was sacred among the Mexicans; on what authority I know not: "*Ita Judæorum est ἐπταήμερον, veterum Romanorum οκταήμερον, Mexicanorum τρισκαιδεκαήμερον*."—*Emend. Temp.* p. 9.

⁹ *Pallas Reisen*, vol. iii, p. 159.

¹ "L'Enfer serait le partage de quiconque se nettoierait les dents ces jours avec sa bague."—*Duhois, Mœurs des Indes*, vol. i, p. 336; and see note ⁸, p. 39.

Ceylon, "four days of the month are dedicated to public worship—the four first days of the changes of the moon; when those who are able attend at the temples. There are no other public days of festival or thanksgiving: all, however, are at liberty to select such days for themselves, and these they particularize by acts of devotion, consisting in fasting, prayer, and forming resolutions for their future good conduct; all which devout acts are addressed to their saviour Boodha."² Every where, then, we find the Sabbath feast, in this sense, *indeed pandemic*; but not therefore do we think it necessary to look for its origin in Egypt, or Israel, or India, or Greece. No: as we breathe the air without teaching, and learn to eat without masters, so also there are in use among us customs so consonant to our nature, so agreeable to the great common-sense of man,³ that every where they must be regarded as original, as proofs of our common Humanity, and not as evidences of a derived civilization.

What now is the revelation contained in this first chapter of Genesis, we will ask? That this world and this heaven were created by God, is the most obvious answer. But this revelation, if it be indeed a revelation,—and some writers have affirmed that it is the only one to which the

² Doctrine of Boodha, by Captain Mahony, Asiatic Researches, vol. vii, p. 40. I will here remark that these festivals, when they are annual, are generally in honour of some person or event; when more frequent, that they are then determined either by the seasons, as harvest or vintage (Potter, book ii, c. xix), or by the changes of the moon, as among the Boodhists, the Greeks, e. g. the *Novμηνια* (Potter, Id. c. xx.), the Romans: "Lunamque accretione et diminutione luminis quasi fastorum notantem et significantem dies." Cicero, Tusc. Quæst. b. i, § 28; and for other examples see Spencer, De Leg. Heb. Dissert. lib. iv, c. i, p. 804.

³ Yet there are nations, so barbarous, to whom the customs more particularly alluded to are unknown. Of the inhabitants of Madagascar the early voyagers tell us: "Ils tiennent qu'il y a un Créateur qui a créé toutes choses; mais ils ne lui adressent pas des prières, et ne lui consacrent aucun jour particulier. *Tous leurs jours sont égaux*, jusque-là qu'ils ne leur donnent point de noms particuliers, et ils ne comptent ni par années, ni par mois, ni par semaines."....."Ils appréhendent fort le Diable..... parcequ'il prend plaisir à leur tourmenter."—Voy. Holland. vol. i, p. 232.

great legislator of the Jews *can lay* any claim—has been made known to man through other lips besides those of Moses. The very savage of Madagascar,⁴ who observes no days and knows neither months nor years, and whose terrors drive him to the worship of the malignant spirit, even he has heard of the great Creator. The West Indian⁵ slave, amidst his multitude of idols, bows also before the God who thunders in the air, and who has created, and is powerful over, all things. Tlascala,⁷ Mexico,⁸ and Peru,⁶ though each bowed and clung rather to his own patron deity, were, nevertheless, not without a knowledge of the one Supreme, the artificer and supporter of the world, the soul of the universe, the ineffable. Ancient Persia worshipped Ormuzd, the first created only, it is true, but in his turn the creator of heaven and earth.⁹ China speaks of the God Self-existent.¹ And India, notwithstanding its thirty-three crore of gods, adores “the supremacy of that divine Sun the God-head, who illuminates all, who re-creates all, from whom all proceed and to whom all must return.”² And not in religions only, those revelations of the mysterious instincts of Humanity, but in philosophy also, that clear and approved knowledge

⁴ Vide note ³, p. 42.

⁵ Inzwischen glauben sie alle dass ein Gott sey.....sie glauben dass er die Menschen und die Welt geschaffen, und über alles Macht habe, dass er in die Luft donnere.Ausser diesen höchsten guten Gott, nimmt der gemeine Haufe noch eine Menge Götter an.”—*Hist. Gen. des Voy.* vol. ii, p. 181.

⁶ Of the Tlascalans Herrera: “Toutes les extravagances de leur Polythéisme ne les empêchoient pas de reconnoître un Dieu supérieur, mais sans le désigner par aucun nom.”—*Hist. Gen. des Voy.* vol. xviii, p. 597, ed. Hol.

⁷ “Amidst their multitude of gods, and the obscurity and blindness of their idolatry, the Mexicans still acknowledged a superior Deity, to whom they attributed the creation

of the Heavens and the Earth..... They only signified that they knew Him by looking up towards Heaven with veneration, and giving him the attribute of Ineffable.—*De Solis*, vol. i, p. 437.

⁸ The Peruvians called the Supreme God “Pachacamac,” translated *sometimes* as “Creator mundi” (*Hist. des Yncas*, vol. i, p. 118) and *at others*, “qui est l’âme de l’univers.”—*Id.* p. 59.

⁹ See Boun-Dehesch, vol. ii. § i.; *Zendavesta*, by Anquetil du Perron.

¹ “Celui qui est lui-même son principe et sa racine, a fait le ciel et la terre, dit Tchouan-tsee.”—*Mémoires Chinoises*, vol. i, p. 105.

² The Gayatri or Holiest Verse of the Vedas.—Vide Sir W. Jones’ *Works*, vol. vi, p. 417, 8vo.

of rational man, and more especially in that philosophy, which devotes itself rather to the study of the human mind than to that of the external world, do we find—and arrived at now by the slower but natural processes of *thought*—a Creator and a creation. What shall we say then? That, through Moses, the Elohim has made known to man *not the fact*, but *the manner and order* of creation; that through him the Deity would teach us, in imitation of himself, to labour six days, and to rest on the seventh? for these things no philosophy could discover, no sagacity divine, no experience verify; and either the Deity must have revealed them to Moses, or Moses must have invented them.³

But wherein, are we now naturally led to inquire, does the Creator God of Moses differ from the Creator God of these many creeds? In this, that, in so far as their supreme God is Creator, these creeds, in contradistinction to the Jewish, do not view Him as the one and sole Creator; or do not sufficiently separate Him from his creation; or do not recognize the creation as originating from the Creator by the force and resolve of His own will, but by a sort of necessity. Or in this, that in so far as the Creator is God, He is for the Jews, in contradistinction to other people, not merely the God of the universe, but the patron God of the nation, the God of Israel; and not only the supreme God, but *the one, the only God*, beside whom there is none other. That, however, we may arrive at no rash and hasty conclusions, we will more closely examine into the Hindoo and Persian conceptions of the Deity, and compare them with the Jewish.

In the *Vedas*, we hear of God as the Creator:—"the Supreme Being alone existed; afterwards there was universal darkness; next, the watery ocean was produced by the diffusion of virtue; then did the Creator, Lord of the

³ Either Moses or some of his predecessors; but *invented*, as the priests of the old world *invented*, who believed what they imagined, for whom imaginings were inspirations. And observe that throughout this Book of Genesis no claim is laid to a revelation; the writer is but a historian.

Universe, rise out of the ocean, and successively frame the sun and the moon, which govern day and night, and whence proceeds the revolution of years; after them, He framed heaven and earth, and the space between the celestial region."⁴

But this Supreme Being, we learn from the institutes of Menu,⁵ also "created an assemblage of inferior deities, with divine attributes and pure souls, and a number of genii exquisitely delicate." But all emanations from God, in proportion as they are distant and detached from their great common source, lose we know a portion of their power and purity. And, we know also, that these created deities are but *murtis* or images of the Creator, the same in kind⁶ with ourselves, though transcendently higher in degree.⁷ They are deities, moreover, whose happiness is affected by human act and thought: we may pain as we may please them: and, as they are far more powerful than ourselves, they may, according as they are gratified or angered by our conduct, reward or punish us. But the supreme⁸ Being—alone in His immensity and perfections—neither man nor god can any way affect. Hence, *on the one side*, the acknowledgment of the great God as a speculative belief merely, without any religious sentiment

⁴ Is this a text of the Vedas, or a commentary only?—Vide On the Ceremonies of the Hindoos, by Colebrooke, Asiatic Researches, vol. v, p. 361.

⁵ Vide c. i, § xxii, and comp. with it § xxxii, in which another origin is given to the inferior deities and to mankind. I presume because the creation in the Institutes is compiled from two different sources.

⁶ Even to our mortality: "The earth is perishable, the ocean, the *gods themselves*—pass away; how should not that bubble, mortal man, meet destruction."—Moral Sentences recited at a Hindoo Funeral.

⁷ Wilford, On the Nile, Asiatic Researches, vol. iii.

⁸ God, the Supreme Ruler, is a

soul distinct from other souls, unaffected by the ills with which they are beset, unconnected with good or bad deeds and their consequences, and with fancies or passing thoughts."—Colebrooke's Essays, vol. i, p. 251. And Wilford tells us of our souls: "Such a murti can by no means affect with any sensation, either pleasing or painful, the being from which it emanates, though it may give pleasure or pain to collateral emanations from the same source. Hence they (the Hindoos) offer no sacrifices to the Supreme Essence, of which our own souls are images, but adore him with silent adoration, &c."—On the Nile, ut supra.

towards Him; and, *on the other*, a parasitical worship of the inferior deities, a scramble for their favour and protection—either *by single acts of devotion*, such as might perchance find grace in the eyes of an ignorant tyrant, or *by the continued observance* of that heavy code of ceremonies and external compliments, which occupies the life of the lower and more superstitious Hindoo,⁹ *i.e.*, a religion, in a word, the highest principle of which is self-advantage,¹ and the motto, “Serve me and I’ll serve thee.”

But the thousand gods of India resolve themselves “into three deities, whose places are the earth, the intermediate region, and the heaven (*viz.* fire, air, and the sun);” and these again are “but portions of the one Deity,” so that in fact there is only one God.² And “that God is the universe and all that has been and will be.”³ “He is Brahme, He is Indra, He is Prajapati, the Lord of creatures, these gods are He, and so are the five primary elements; earth, air, the ethereal fluid, water and light.”... “HE it is who pervades all regions, HE prior to whom nothing was born, and who became all things, even HE is the first-born, it is HE who is in the womb, HE who is born and HE who will be produced. HE, severally and universally remains with all persons.”... “In HIM the universe perpetually exists, in HIM this world is absorbed; from HIM it issues; and in creatures HE is twined and wove with various forms of existence.”⁵ Here then we have a determined and *material* Pantheism, in which not only God is all things, but in which also all things, each and individually, are God.

But this material Pantheism,⁶ as the system of Spinoza

⁹ See Colebrooke, *On the Religious Ceremonies of the Hindoos*, Asiatic Researches, vol. v, p. 345.

¹ “Les Indiens ont pour principe invariable, qu’il faut honorer tout être, animé ou non, qui a le pouvoir de nous faire du bien ou du mal.”—Dubois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. ii, p. 297.

² Colebrooke, *Asiatic Researches*, vol. viii, p. 307.

³ *Id. id.* vol. vii, p. 251.

⁴ *Id. id.* vol. viii, p. 426.

⁵ *Id. id.* p. 433.

⁶ The historical progress of the Brahminical faith is perhaps hinted at in the lessons which Varuna gives his son Bhṛigu. Bhṛigu asks of his father to make known to him Brahme. Varuna answers: “That whence all things are produced, that by which they live when born,

was succeeded by that of Berkeley, seems very soon to have been subtilized into a spiritual one. For, already in the Vedanta, we find that God alone exists; and that this external universe,—earth and sky, rock, tree, and flower, man and beast, and all living creatures—are but unreal shadows, and, like the idle mockery of a dream, exist in appearance only; that they are mere impressions produced on the mind by the Deity, the mind's *Maya* or Delusion.⁷ But for a doctrine thus metaphysical, the vulgar adulation, the painful ceremonies of the ignorant Hindoo, are manifestly insufficient and absurd.⁸ To a purely spiritual God, the philosophical Brahmin owes a purely spiritual worship; and we find him, therefore, “with no companion but his own soul,” seated in delighted meditation “on the Supreme Spirit,” till “he remains absorbed in the Divine Essence.”⁹

But as from the one immutable Being, who alone is truth and everlasting knowledge,¹ man is detained by his obstinate clinging to sense and outward things; from sense and its ever-mutable illusions he must struggle to extricate himself. He must live without passion and without will, without affection and without desire.² He must see all things in God and God in all things—God

that towards which they tend, and that into which they pass, do thou seek, for that is Brahme.” Bhrigu meditates profoundly, and recognizes *food*, or *body*, to be Brahme; but yet, unsatisfied, he meditates again, and discovers *breath*, or *life*, to be Brahme; and again meditating, he then finds *intellect* to be Brahme; and having meditated once more, he knows *Ananda*, or *felicity*, to be Brahme. Such is the science which was attained by Bhrigu, taught by Varuna, and founded on the supreme ethereal Spirit.”—Colebrooke's Essays, vol. i, p. 77.

⁷ “Except the first Cause, whatever may appear and may not appear in the mind, know that to be the mind's *maya*, or delusion, as light as darkness.”—Sir W. Jones,

On the Gods of India, Greece, and Italy, Asiatic Researches, vol. i, p. 245.

⁸ “It is true knowledge, as *Capila*, &c. insist, that alone can secure entire and permanent deliverance from evil; whereas temporal means are insufficient for that end, and the spiritual resources of practical religion imperfect.”—On the Philosophy of the Hindoos, Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, vol. i, p. 238.

⁹ Institutes of Menu, c. vi, 49, 82.

¹ “Brahme is truth, the one immutable Being; He is truth and everlasting knowledge.”—Veda, Asiatic Researches, vol. v, p. 362.

² Colebrook's Essays, vol. i, p. 237; Menu, c. vi, 60, 80, 81.

everywhere, God alone.³ Abstracted from all temporal cares, all earthly thoughts, and all moral interests, and ever fixed in contemplation on the Divine Nature, the purified saint then disdains all action⁴ as unworthy of him; and strong in faith and knowledge,⁵ and with the mystic Om,⁶ the all powerful name of God, ever upon his lips, he prepares himself for that union with the Divine Essence which will identify him with the divine soul.⁷

Here then is a mystic religion, which prefers meditation to action, nay, regards all action as indifferent; which places man's greatness in the abnegation of his self-consciousness;⁸ which calls indeed for faith, and a pure service,⁹ but allows or overlooks all crime; which separates the doer from the deed, and the man's life, the outward and visible sign, from himself, the inward and spiritual grace.

³ "Equally perceiving the Supreme Soul in all beings, and all beings in the Supreme Soul, *he sacrifices his own spirit by fixing it on the Spirit of God*, and approaches the nature of that sole Divinity who shines by his own effulgence."—Menu, c. xii, 91.

⁴ "En ce monde le vrai dévot dédaigne toute action."—Bhagavad Gita. From Cousin Cours de Philosophie, vol. ii, p. 137; and see also note 10, in Wilkins' Translation of the Bhagavat-Gita.

⁵ "Celui qui a la foi et la science, et celui qui a la science et la foi, par cela seul, atteint à la tranquillité suprême."—Cousin, Ibid.

⁶ "He who having closed the door of his faculties, locked up his mind in his own breast, and fixed his spirit in his head, standing firm in the exercise of devotion, repeating in silence Om! the mystic sign of Brahme, shall, on his quitting his mortal frame, calling upon me, without doubt go the journey of supreme happiness."—Bhagavad, lesson viii, Wilkins', p. 76. See also note ** to Prelude in "The

Hero and the Nymph," Wilson's Hindoo Theatre, vol. i, p. 195.

⁷ "The whole scope of the Vedanta," says Colebrooke, "is to teach a doctrine, by the knowledge of which, an exemption from metempsychosis shall be attainable."—Essays, vol. i, p. 237.

⁸ "Individual souls emanate from the Supreme one...are of the same essence...*the soul's activity is not of its essence*, but inductive through its organs; it is a sufferer by means of its organs; and *disinterested of them, and returning to the Supreme one, it is at rest and happy*."—Id. p. 372.

⁹ "Le plus criminel, s'il me sert sans partage, est purifié et sanctifié par-là."—(Bhagavad (from Cousin, Cours de Philosophie, vol. ii.) And again: "Fusses-tu souillé de tous les péchés, à l'abri de la science tu échapperas à l'enfer."—Id. (from Langjuiniais Œuvres, vol. v, p. 161). And: "He who fully understands the omnipresence of God, can be led no more captive by criminal acts." See Menu, vi, 74.

But the Hindoo doctrine of God has also its favourable side. For the thousand deities of the vulgar-creed,¹ although rejected by the wiser Brahmin, are, at the same time, considered by him as portions, as indistinct apperceptions, of the one Supreme. His faith, therefore, like the Jewish, acknowledges God's unity; but, unlike the Jewish, it is devoid of all exclusiveness.² It is tolerant in its very nature. It allows to other creeds their just pretensions. It thrusts not out the poor idolator from all hope of the blessings³ he so earnestly prays for. It holds out to him the words of promise. It but asks of him faith,—faith in the gods whom he acknowledges; for the Great God it is whom all worship, though perhaps blindly, though perhaps involuntarily; and the Great God it is, who is their reward.⁴ This creed, then, more than any other, sees the connexion that necessarily exists between religion, in so far as it is something positive, and the state of the mind's development; and the very differences and discrepancies we find in it, are perhaps but so many phases which

¹ "As the ignorant perform the duties of life from the hope of reward, so the wise man, out of respect to the opinions and prejudices of mankind, should perform the same without motives of interest. He should not create a division in the understanding of the ignorant who are inclined to outward works. The learned man, by industriously performing all the duties of life, should induce the vulgar to attend to them."—Bhagavat, Wilkins, p. 47.

² "A man's own religion, though contrary to, is better than the faith of another, let it be ever so well followed. *It is good to die in one's own faith, for another faith beareth fear.*"—Id. les. iii, p. 49.

³ How beautiful, how tender is this declaration of the Supreme Spirit: "I accept and enjoy the holy offerings of the humble soul, who in his worship presenteth leaves, and flowers, and fruit, and

water unto me."—Id. Lesson ix, p. 81.

⁴ "Quelle que soit l'image que le suppliant adore dans sa foi, c'est moi seul qui lui inspire cette foi," dit Chrishna, dans le Bhagavad-Gita; "cette foi avec laquelle il tâche de rendre cette image propice, et obtient enfin l'objet de ses désirs, ainsi que je l'ai déterminé... Ceux qui adorent d'autres Dieux avec une ferme foi, m'adorent aussi, quoique involontairement; je participe à tous les cultes, et je suis leur récompense."—(From B. Constant, De la Religion, note, lib. iv, c. 11) Bhagavad, Les. ix, Wilkins; see also Id. close of Les. vii. That this tolerance is not merely speculative, the conduct of the Brahmins to Dubois is evidence. They invited him into their temples, and they gave him materials for repairing, and ground on which to build, churches. Vide Dubois, Mœurs des Indes, vol. i, p. 425-6.

it puts on, in order the more readily to accommodate itself to different grades of civilization, or of individual intelligence.

Again, the Brahminical Deity is One and Creator, and he is also Creation. He is God and Nature, every thing. His unity is universality. He appears before us, infinite, unalterable, invisible, without form, without passion,—and his religion, like himself, is universal. It rejects all accidents, all ceremonies; it rises even above the Vedas,⁵ the productions of the great Brahme;⁶ it speaks of a superior science, by which the everlasting Lord, present every where, may be apprehended,—of a science within every man's power. It tells us that to become like God, we must meditate continuously on the Divine perfections, and give ourselves up to the contemplation of the Divine nature. And who can do this? who can have his mind and heart occupied with great thoughts; and still cling to that littleness, egotism, and selfishness,⁷ which it is the end of all morality and religion to destroy?⁸

⁵ Menu speaks of a Brahmin of the highest order, as “having abandoned all ceremonial acts and relinquished all forms” (vi, 95, 96), and the Bhagavat (Les. ii, p. 39) thus describes all ceremonial worshippers: “Men of confined notions, *delighting in the controversies of the Vedas*, tainted with worldly lusts, and *preferring a transient enjoyment of Heaven to eternal absorption*, whilst they declare that there is no other reward, pronounce, *for the attainment of worldly riches and enjoyments*, flowery sentences, *ordaining innumerable and manifold ceremonies*, and *promising rewards* for the actions of this life.” See also Les. iv, p. 54; Les. vi, p. 64, 67; and Les. viii, p. 77.

⁶ “From air, from fire, and from the sun he milked out the three primordial Vedas.”—Institutes of Menu, c. i, § 23, Sir W. Jones.

⁷ “If one whose ways are ever so evil serve me alone, he is as re-

spectable as the just man,” says the Bhagavat; but it is added: “he is altogether well employed; *he soon becometh of a virtuous spirit*, and obtaineth eternal happiness.”—Les. ix, p. 82.

⁸ Of the large spirit of the Brahminical faith, I will add, as exemplifications, two precepts drawn from the most caste-like of its books. *The one* is practical. Among the oblations of the Brahmins is one “for the welfare of all creatures;”—in his alms, “dogs, outcasts, dogfeeders, sinful men punished with elephantiasis or consumption,” have a share (c. iii, 91-3). *The other*, doctrinal: “A believer in Scripture may receive pure knowledge even from a Sudra, a lesson of the highest virtue even from a Chandala, and a woman, bright as a gem, even from the basest family; even from the poison, nectar may be taken; even from a child, gentleness of speech; even

The Jewish Elohim is Creator, and, unlike the Hindu Brahme, He is distinct from His creation. He is One; but infinity, unalterableness, universality, though applied to Him as attributes, are not His characteristics. He is One and Individual. He has the passions and feelings, the preferences and antipathies, the changeable will of the individual.⁹ He now works, and now rests, and now rejoices in, and now repents Him, of His work. He does not, like the great Brahme, pervade His creation. He has His chosen dwelling, His favoured land, His own special temple, His holy of holies. He looks not on the great family of man with an equal eye, as His children; He has His eldest born, His favourite, His peculiar people. He is not so much the God of the universe, as the God of Abraham, and the God of Abraham and Isaac, and afterwards the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and, finally, the God of Israel. He is a family God,¹ gradually growing into a national Deity.

His laws and His religion partake of His character. They are special laws, and not the great universal laws of Humanity; they are *special* laws, intended for His own people, and for them only; and they are laws, which are no doubt very well adapted to a half-barbaric, half-civilized, state of society; but which, as *special*, are necessarily revocable, such as according to circumstances man may modify, or even annul; and yet the Deity issues them as permanent and unchangeable, and threatens all non-

from a foe, prudent conduct; and even from an impure substance, gold."—c. ii, 238-9.

⁹ The general characteristic of the Deity of uncivilized, uneducated man, is power influenced by human motives. The god has the passions of Humanity, but not its infirmities; he is a man, wanting the grace of sympathy with weakness. In exemplification of my meaning I will refer—in the Jewish history, to the frequent intercessions of Moses for his people—for the Grecian view, to the remarkable

dialogue between Ulysses and Minerva, in the first scene of Sophocles' "Ajax Mastigophoros."

¹ "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem," even Noah exclaims; and does not the xviiith Psalm (19, 20), by the sort of contrast which it draws between *the sun and moon* which God has imparted to the nations of the earth, and, the *Lord*, who took, as if especially, and brought the Israelites out of Egypt, show a jealous fear lest the God of the Jews should be considered a universal God?

observance of them with the same punishment as a violation of the moral law.

Is, then, the Deity of Moses so poor a conception? Who will dare to say, yea, with the God of Christianity before him? If the Elohim of Moses is the God of an infant people, He is also, we must remember, the *Invisible*, the one God, the Creator. His people avoid, therefore the abuses of a Pagan idolatry, and its hopelessly sensual worship; and, as they advance in civilization, their Deity loses his narrow, and merely national, character, and gradually appears to them as the God of the world and of Humanity. He retains his individuality, and yet is universal as the Supreme Soul of the Hindus; and His religion, with a moral law, which no sophistry can bend to its purposes, and no fanaticism break through, then unites all the tolerance of the Brahminical, with all the strictness of the Jewish, creed. Yes, poor as we may deem the religion and the Deity of Moses, they promise, as the event indeed has shown, more and better for mankind than the God and the religion of the Vedas.

In the ancient Persian faith, we have the one first God—"Zeruane Akèrene"—"Time without bounds,"² the Being absorbed in his own excellence"—of whom we know but this, that He exists, and that He produced or created two beings, Ormuzd and Ahriman, who inhabit the abysses—the *one* of the primal light, the *other* of the primal darkness.³

Ormuzd began the work of creation. He pronounced the holy *Honover*, and thus gave existence to the pure worlds and their holy inhabitants. But now "arose Ahriman, the evil one, and drew near to the light. And when he saw the light of Ormuzd, he who is eager to strike as a Daroudj, and swift to destroy, he rushed towards the light to spoil it; but, daunted by its beauty, and splendour, and grandeur, he shrunk back into the thick darkness, his

² Fargard xix, Zend. vol. i, p. 413: "L'Etre absorbé dans l'excellence l'a donné; le tems sans bornes t'a donné; il a aussi donné avec grandeur les Amschaspands, &c." See also Boun-Dehesch, § i.
³ See Boun-Dehesch, vol. ii, p. 345, Zend.

first habitation, and spawned there Dews and Daroudjs to torment the world.⁴

Then Ormuzd made, *first*, the heaven; *secondly*, the water; *thirdly*, the earth; *fourthly*, trees; *fifthly*, animals; and *sixthly* and lastly, man:⁵ and all these he created pure and good. But Ahriman and his Dews enter into, and mix with, and corrupt, the creation of Ormuzd: they defile the water, and the trees, and the very light; and Ahriman penetrates to heaven itself, and leaps down upon, and shatters, the earth towards the south, and every thing becomes black as night; he infests it with flies, and all venomous animals.⁶

Both the *Brahminical* and the *Persian faith* acknowledge One Supreme, who "sits on his vast and solitary throne," mere immeasurable, passive, existence. And in *both*, this one Being produces a first angel or first God, who in his turn produces, *first*, the intelligible⁷ world, or the world of light, the *κοσμος νοητος* of the Platonic, and the *παντοκρατορικη έδρα* of the Pythagoric, schools; and,

⁴ Night is the original home and dwelling-place of Ahriman; and in Hesiod, Night is made to bring forth "cruel fate, terrible necessity, and death, sleep, and dreams. She bears, too, Momus and corroding grief, and the Hesperides who watch the golden fruit. The fatal goddesses Clotho, Lachesis, Atropos, are daughters of Night.....She produced, also, Nemesis, so pernicious to man, and Fear, and criminal Love, and infirm Age, and Discord... She in her turn gave birth to labour, and care, and tearful grief, combat and death, war and carnage, quarrels, and lies, and contempt of law and crime."—Theog. 212. Are not these the Dews and Daroudjs of the Persian faith? and yet how clearly the original production of the Grecian mind!

⁵ Boun-Dehesch. § ii.

⁶ "Ensuite Ahriman se présente

à la lumière avec tous les Dews; il vit le ciel; les Dews qui ne cherchent qu'à détruire portèrent dessus l'oppression. Ahriman seul pénètre dans le ciel. Sous la forme d'une couleuvre il sauta du ciel sur la terre.....Il alla dans l'eau... il alla ensuite sur les arbres, sur les taureaux, sur Kaiomorts et sur le feu. Sous la forme d'une mouche, il couroit sur tout qui avait été donné. Il brisa entièrement le monde vers le midi; tout fut noir comme pendant la nuit. Il mit ensuite sur la terre la couleuvre, le scorpion, le crapaud."—Id. p. 352, 355.

⁷ With the duties of the Amshaspands in the Persian, may be compared those of the Lokapalas in the Hindoo faith. See Boun-Dehesch, and note †, p. 219, vol. i, Wilson's Hindoo Theatre.

afterwards, this visible universe. In the *Brahminical creed*, however, this production takes place *by emanation*; in the *Persian*, by *creation*. Hence a difference in the relations in which, in each creed, the first God stands to man. For, as all emanations however distant retain, nevertheless some portion, never mind how small, of the nature of the being from whom they are derived; and as they may all return to, and be resolved in, that being, and again identified with him; Brahme may possibly become an object of practical adoration to the Hindu; while to the Persian, Zeruane Akerene, as the creator of both light and darkness, good and evil, as the first father of both Amschaspands and Dews, can never be other than a curious speculation,—never more than the unity in numbers, or the point in mathematics.⁸ He is *necessarily* altogether withdrawn from our views, and hopes, and aspirations. He promises nothing; he appears neither to dispense temporal blessings, nor to cherish and uphold moral excellence. A thick veil hides him from our eyes, and one which is never raised, and never can be rent.

If now we compare the Persian with the Mosaical faith, *in both* we find a good and wise Creator, and *in both* the same manner and order of creation. In six different times, in six days of heaven (but six thousand years of earth) does Ormuzd, like the Elohim of Moses, by the mere expression of his will, create the world. Like Him, he begins his work with the creation of heaven and earth, and like Him proceeds to that of the sun, moon, and stars, and like Him ends with that of man, and with a single man, from whom are descended all mankind. The one cosmogony, however, presumes *light, the other* darkness; and *this* first creates the man, and then forms the woman from the rib of the man, while *that* produces both from the seed of the first bull-man *Kaiomorts*.

⁸ The Persian creed has not, it must be remembered, received the development of the Brahminical and the Jewish. If the speculative Persian, however, occupied himself

with the first God, I presume that, viewing him as the origin of both good and evil, he would be almost necessarily led to moral indifferentism.

Again, in both Genesis and the Zendavesta, the earth is but a flat surface;⁹ and, in both, the heaven a firm dome; in Moses, however, it is a dome ornamented with "patens of bright¹ gold," and self-supported, "by its own weight made stedfast and immovable;" whilst, according to Zoroaster, it rests on the ever-growing mountain Albordj,² but is inhabited by living stars, Ormuzd's chosen attendants. In both, water is above the heaven,³ through whose opened windows it is poured forth on the earth; but, in the Persian creation, there is above this water a higher heaven, wanting to the Hebrew: this is, the infinite kingdom of light, the bright palace of Ormuzd.

But Zoroaster differs materially from both Moses and the Vedas, in that he shows us not one, but two creators; that to the God of good, he opposes the God of evil; and to the creation of Ormuzd, the creation of Ahriman. And these Gods and their creations he shows us, moreover, not separated from each other by any great and impassable gulph, but at continued and ever-during war, with this world as their battle-field, and man as the prize of the victor. And man is the creation of Ormuzd,⁴ and, like

⁹ "The Jews, and the ancients generally, considered the earth as a flat surface. This idea was a most natural one, till the study of astronomy had undeceived the learned, who, in these early times, did not deceive the vulgar."—Welford, *Isles of the West, Asiatic Researches*, vol. viii, p. 272; and for the views of the People of America, the *Tlascalans*; vide note ¹, p. 3.

¹ I speak of the stars as they seemed to Moses, not of the stars as they appear: in Enoch, where they are angels, distinctly angels: or, in some of the Chaldaic portions of Isaiah, where the notions of star and angel mingle and flow one into the other. Isaiah xxiv, 21: "The host of the High One on High...Himmelsheer, worunter Man Sterne und Engel, vorzugsweise letztere verstand, doch so, dass die Begriffe

zuweilen in einander fließen."—Gesenius *Comment in Jesai*, vol. i, p. 772.

² See Boun-Dehesch, vol. ii, p. 364, § xi, *Zend.*, and "Les astres, peuple excellent et céleste."—*Vendidad-Sadi*, id. vol. p. 87.

³ From a single expression in the Boun-Dehesch, I presume this was the Persian view. See Ahriman's journey to Heaven, described in Boun-Dehesch, § i. We are told that, "Il vit le ciel, mais il fut brisé et saisi de frayeur, comme l'est le brebis devant le loup. Il alla dans l'eau, *il vit la terre dessous.*"

⁴ Man, in so far as he is a Persian, and a worshipper of Ormuzd. As he is a foreigner, a worshipper of Ahriman, he is a Kharfester, impure, a creation of Ahriman. Thus *Ha xix*, vol. i, p. 138, *Zend.*: "Zo-

him, pure and good; but Dews, male and female, swarm over the earth, and fill every creek and crevice like water,⁵ and lie in wait to do the believer harm, and beset his path to tempt him to wrong. What, then, shall save him from enemies thus numerous and thus powerful? The stars, which are angels,⁶ and the Izeds, the faithful troops of heaven,⁷ every where protect and bring assistance to the worshipper of Ormuzd. And the religion of Zoroaster teaches him besides, words and ceremonies, before which the evil genii flee abashed, and terrified, and heart-crushed. Here, then, an almost inevitable consequence of the thousand spirit enemies which press around us and would ensnare our souls, we have a creed which invests with an infallible power certain charms and formulas,⁸ a religion of faith in words and forms, a magic religion.⁹

roastre consulta Ormuzd. O Ormuzd! qui est cette grande parole qui existoit avant le ciel.....avant l'homme pur, avant les Dews, *les Kharfesters, hommes productions des Dews, &c.*" And also we hear of Dews: "les productions des Dews, qui paroissent sous la forme de l'homme."—Id. p. 194. The Jews have the same notion: "Die Juden glauben das alle die Seelen derjenigen, welche keine Juden sind, von den unreinen Geistern und Teufeln herkommen, &c." Eisenmenger, *Des Entdeckten Judenthums*, vol. ii, part ii, c. i, p. 1.

⁵ "Les Dews se répandent, O Zoroastre! dans les Dakhmes, comme l'eau coule et pénètre partout."—Farg. vii, p. 326, vol. i, Zend.; and again, *Ha xxxii*, p. 171, Id.: "Il dit, lui qui n'a appris que le mal, qu'il tourmentera l'homme qui vit bien, qui parle avec intelligence; l'eau ne coulera plus, les biens qui viennent de Bahman (the pure animal creation) disparaîtront.Il dit, je gâterai, en les regardant d'un œil mauvais, les troupeaux créés grands, le pur soleil donné pour durer longtems; je

ferai que les pâturages seront sans eaux, ainsi que tout ce que vous avez créé de pur.....Qu'il ne détruise pas ce qui a couvé, ce qui vit. Que ceux qui existent vivent longtems, grands et sans crainte! Vieillez, brillant, pur, et excellent Ormuzd, sur celui qui déchire les saints de cœur."

⁶ Vide Boun-Dehesch, § ii. Does not Deut. iv. 19, allude to this belief?

⁷ They are of heaven and of earth. *Afrin du Gehanbar*, vol. ii, p. 82, Zend. and Boun-Dehesch, id. § ii, p. 349.

⁸ How grateful these formulas are to the superior powers, may be seen from the *Afrin du Gehanbar*, ut supra; and, how terrible to the Dews, from x, xi, xviii Farg. Zend.

⁹ I use the word *magic* in no bad sense. The formulas of the Zend creed were not the heir-loom of a priest-class; they were no secret and mystic words known only to the few initiated, and efficacious only when pronounced by them; but they were the published law and the common prayer of a people, and their meaning and objects were evi-

If now we examine these two principles, as seen in their respective creations, we find that to Ormuzd belong all the grandeur and beauty of the universe, and all useful animals. To man he gives health of body, riches, all temporal blessings, and more than this, all moral and intellectual excellence. He creates him pure, holy, and loving the law. From Ahriman,¹ on the other hand, proceed all the convulsions and eccentricities of nature; his are the comet, the storm, and the earthquake; his the smoke in fire, the blight on trees, the winter in the seasons, and the serpent, and the toad, and all noxious and venomous insects: on man he has brought all physical disease, all temporal miseries, and all moral impurity. He is the author of all evil.²

But, in all creeds, the favoured of the Deity are known by the blessings which the Deity heaps upon them. Now Ormuzd is the creator and dispenser of all good things, spiritual and temporal, as Ahriman of all things evil and impure. The true worshipper of Ormuzd, therefore, prays for, and possesses, not merely spiritual peace, but all other blessings. If his creed requires him to be pure of mind, it as imperiously demands that he should be also strong,

dent; they were the law of, and prayers addressed to, the Great Principle of Good, and a law and prayers to which that Principle had given a power over the Dews. Magic, in the ordinary sense, is hateful to Ormuzd, the production of Ahriman: "Ensuite ce Peetiare Ahriman, plein de mort, y produisit la magie, art très mauvais. La Magie fait paroître tout ce qu'on désire; elle donne tout. Lorsque le magicien arrive, lorsqu'on le voit, la magie paroît quelque chose de grande; mais lorsqu'elle se présente avec le plus d'empire elle ne vient que du mauvais principe, du chef des maux. Elle est éloignée du grand, de celui qui fait le bien."—Farg. i, 268.

¹ See the reasons which induced the Zend people to leave their se-

veral places of residence, Farg. i, 263; and Boun-Dehesch, p. 354, and note, p. 164.

² But how is it that water drowns? that fire burns? that the pure creation of Ormuzd destroys the Ormuzd worshipper? are questions which naturally suggest themselves, and which Zoroaster asked and Ormuzd answered: "Est-ce l'eau qui frappe l'homme qui y est noyé? Ormuzd répondit: Ce n'est pas l'eau qui frappe l'homme. Le Dew Astouiad lie celui qui tombe dedans; et lorsqu'il est ainsi lié, les poissons le frappent, &c."—"Est-ce le feu qui frappe l'homme? Ormuzd répondit: Le feu ne frappe pas l'homme; c'est le Dew Astouiad qui le lie; et lorsqu'il est ainsi lié, les oiseaux le frappent, &c."—Farg. v, Id. vol. i, p. 199.

and healthy, and pure of body; it almost insists, too, that he should be rich considered.³ He must, in every respect, be out of the dominion of Ahriman. The creed of Zoroaster then confounds together, as proceeding from one common source, that good which naturally and necessarily results from a moral and religious frame of mind, with those advantages which commonly accompany the exercise of the prudential virtues:⁴ and it does this, not as the other olden religions, from some erroneous and narrow view of the character of the Deity, which time may enlighten and enlarge, but as an inevitable consequence of its double creation. It is, therefore, a creed exclusive⁵ like the Jewish, but without its scope for improvement; and one which, though it may have been useful in its day, is so at

³ See the ix and xlii Ha, Zend. vol. i, p. 120, 187; Farg. v, id. p. 310: "Je fais tomber la pluie sur la nourriture de l'homme juste, et sur les pâturages de l'animal pur." See also the laws respecting the diseases of women; the several prayers of Zoroaster to Hom; and the Carde xxiv, vol. ii, p. 264, where, of the law of Ormuzd, it is said: "Elle est céleste, elle multiplie dans les villes la force de l'eau et des arbres; elle multiplie dans les villes l'eau profonde et les arbres; elle multiplie dans les villes la pureté et l'immortalité dans tout le peuple donné excellent, &c." And again: "Celui qui a marché sur les pierres (en prononçant le Baraschnom), s'il est dans la disette, sera dans l'abondance; il aura des enfans s'il n'en a pas; il deviendra riche s'il n'a pas de biens."—Fargard v, vol. i, p. 296. And again: "Comment sera-t-on pur? comment vivra-t-on long-tems, deviendra-t-on grand, sage, intelligent? dites le moi? Cela ne viendra-t-il pas de l'intelligence de ta loi, O! pur Ormuzd?"—Ha xxx, vol. i, p. 163.

⁴ See, for instance, Vendidad, Fargard xx, in which are enume-

rated the services of Feridoun, the first of the Pischdadians, who first drove away the Dews, and thus purified the land of Iran; and Malcolm, History of Persia, vol. i, p. 14. See also among the Ieschts Sades, the Patet de l'Iran, which contains a confession of all crimes of commission and omission, and which confounds together moral, prudential, and ceremonial errors (Zend. vol. ii, p. 41); and the xiii Fargard, which accounts for the ills that sometimes fall even upon the faithful.—Ib. vol. i, p. 410.

⁵ Like the Jewish, willingly receiving converts into its bosom: "Faites attention, O Ormuzd, à celui qui fait le mal; que j'aie la pure satisfaction de le voir connoître la pureté du cœur" (xlvii Ha); but also like the Jewish, terrible in its hate against unbelievers. Nereng lxx is thus headed: "Nereng, que l'on récite en tuant les Kharfesters" (Zend. vol. ii, p. 135); and see also Ha viii, p. 106, where Zoroaster announces his law as one "qui prononce une imprécation de tourmens et de malheurs contre tous ceux qui dans le monde sont adorateurs des Dews."

variance with an advanced civilization, that, notwithstanding its morality, which is more spiritual⁶ than that of Moses, and more practical than that of the Vedas, we may at once pronounce it unfitted ever to represent the religion of Humanity.

Finally, we may regard, as connected with this chapter:

i. All the laws of Moses relating to idolatry, as the first and second commandments, in so far as they forbid the worship, *one*, of other Gods besides the Lord; the *other*, of images which are the likeness of any thing in heaven above, &c. (Exod. xx. ; Deut. iv. 16-19.)

ii. The laws relating to feasts, in so far as feasts are determined by the different phases of the moon, &c. (Lev. xxiii. and comp. Gen. i. 14.)

iii. The laws relating to meats, as permitted or forbidden. (Lev. xi.)

And iv. The laws relating to the Sabbath, and the Sabbatical year. (Vide Exod. xx. and xxiii.)

⁶ “ Que par moi, qui suis Zoroastre, s'élève et se répande dans les lieux.....cette loi, qui enseigne à être pur de pensée, pur de parole, pur d'action; cette loi de Zoroastre, l'homme d'Ormuzd, qui adresse une bénédiction de lumière et de bonheur à tous les purs du monde.”—Ha viii, Zend. vol. i, p. 106.

CHAPTER II.

GENESIS II. 4—25.

Verses 4, 5: How confused is this passage as it stands in our translation: how little connexion is there between the several parts! It opens, apparently, with a prefatory verse, which announces to us the subject matter of the chapter: that the mystery of the generations of the heavens and the earth, and “of the plants of the field before they were in the earth, and of the herbs of the field before they grew,” is about to be declared to us; and then, forgetting its lofty promise, it closes with the reason why plants could not grow, or why they were not yet in the earth: “for the Lord God had not caused it to rain on the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground.”

If, however, we follow the translation of Michaelis¹ and De Wette,² and substitute, as has been somewhere suggested by Eichhorn, a period for the comma after “created;” if we read the passage thus:—

Verse 1: “These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created. *Verse 2:* In the day

¹ Dis war der Anfang von Himmel und Erde, da sie geschaffen wurden, als der Gott Jehovah Himmel und Erde machte. Es war aber noch kein Buschwerk auf dem Felde, und Krauter waren noch nicht hervorwachsen, denn der Gott, Jehovah, hatte noch nicht auf dem Erdboden regen lassen, und waren kein Menschen da, ihn zu bauen.”—Michaelis Übersetz. d. A. T.

² Diess ist der Ursprung des Himmels und der Erde, da sie geschaffen wurden, da Gott Jehovah Himmel und Erde machte. Da war noch kein Gesträuch auf der Erde, und kein Kraut des Feldes war noch gesprosset, denn Gott, Jehovah, liess nicht regnen auf der Erde, und kein Mensch war da, das Land zu bauen.”—De Wette. And see also Simon, Hist. Crit. du Vieux Test. lib. ii, c. iv, p. 369.

that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb yet grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground:"—then we have the first as a prefatory verse; while the second, supposing earth and heaven to be already created, shows us the state of the earth at its creation,—it was barren: and the reason of that state,—it was barren, because "the Lord God had not yet caused it to rain on the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground."

The chapter then proceeds to tell us how these deficiencies were supplied:

1st. By a heavy dew (ver. 6.) "But there went up a mist from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground." The Author of the creation in the first chapter seems to have been perplexed by the quantity of superfluous water at his command. Water, or rather mud, was his original matter; and, after having placed water above the heavens, he drains the earth, and forms seas. The Author of the creation in this chapter, on the contrary, seems at a loss for water. The earth is for him a dry rock, or a sandy waste, and he waters it with dew. His primal matter, whatever else it may have been, was evidently not water.³ The one cosmogony belongs, we would conjecture, to a country in which water abounds, the plains of Egypt⁴ or Chaldea;⁵ the other to some hot and dry latitudes, the upper and mountainous parts of Asia, or the deserts of Arabia.

2ndly. By the creation of man. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground," &c. In the preceding chapter, man was the Elohim's last creation, and *there*

³ In this chapter observe that no mention whatever is made of the creation of the fish of the sea.

⁴ According to the Egyptians: Ἡ μὲν μία τῶν ὅλων ἀρχὴ Σκοτὸς ἀγνώστον ὑμνοῦμεν καὶ τοῦτο τρεῖς ἀναφωνοῦμεν οὕτως· τὰς δὲ δύο ἀρχὰς Ὑδωρ καὶ Ψαμμόν. . . ἐξ ὧν καὶ

μεθ' ἧς γεννηθῆναι τὸν πρῶτον Καμῆφιν.—Damascius, p. 320, Cory.

⁵ See the Cosmogony of Berosus, who speaks of that time: ἐν ᾧ τὸ παν σκοτὸς καὶ ὕδωρ εἶναι· and again ὕγρου γὰρ οὐτος τοῦ παντός, καὶ ζῶων ἐν αὐτῷ γεγεννημένων, &c.—Cory, p. 24, 25.

the writer dwelt on the shape and form given to man: "male and female, and in His own image," we are told, "created He them:" but whether a single pair, or whether several, is left uncertain; *here* man is Jehovah Elohim's first creation, and here we are occupied with the material of which man was framed: of the dust of the ground one man is formed, Adam: and of one of his ribs is subsequently made the woman.⁶ And from this pair are descended all the varieties of the human race.⁷

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground."

Many are the origins which man has fabled for himself. Either he is a spontaneous production of mere matter; sometimes *of water*, as in the Lamaic creed:⁸ but more generally *of earth*, as among the Peruvians, Collas, Caribbees,⁹ and the North American Indians,¹ &c., where he

⁶ I do not mean to assert that there is any contradiction between the first and second chapters; on the contrary, it is just possible that they proceed from the same pen, and that the second but explains and limits the meaning of the first.

⁷ These discrepancies Philo Judæus gets over by supposing *the man* of the first chapter to be a *merely intellectual creation*, while the man in this second chapter is *the actual real man*: ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαπλασθεὶς ἤδη αἰσθητός, μετεχὼν ποιητήτος, ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστας, &c.: "*Qui enim nunc formatur sensibilis est, particeps qualitatis et corpore constans et anima, vir et mulier natura mortalis. Ille vero ad imaginem factus, idea quædam, aut genus aut signaculum, intelligibilis, incorporeus, nec mas nec fœmina, naturaliter incorruptibilis.*"—De Mund. Opif. p. 30. To this explanation the objections are: 1st. That any division of the creation into the *κοσμος νοητος* and *κοσμος αισθητος*, on which Philo's view is founded, is wholly un-

known to the Mosaical books; it is a Platonic doctrine, though probably borrowed from the East. And, 2dly, That the creation in chap. i., is of man *as male and female*, and consequently, according to Philo's own showing, not of man *as intelligible and incorporeal*.

⁸ Vide Pallas' Travels, vol. ii, p. 234.

⁹ The Peruvians, *i. e.*, the people, believed that the world was peopled by four men and four women, brothers and sisters, who appeared from openings in certain rocks near Cuzco (Hist. des Yncas, B. i). For the various but similar conjectures on this subject of the Collas, a people conquered by the Peruvians, see Id. p. 111; for those of the Caribbees, Sitten der Wilden, vol. ii.

¹ "They consider the earth as their universal mother. They believe that they were created within its bosom, where, for a long time, they had their abode, before they came to live on its surface. Among the Delawares, those of the Wolf tribe say, that in the beginning they

steps forth from fountain, rock, or cave. Or, he is formed out of earth by some superior power, as in ancient Egypt,² India,³ China,⁴ some parts of Mexico,⁵ and among the Yncas Amantas of Peru. Or, he is formed out of earth by the addition of some other thing; as among the ancient Chaldeans,⁶ who supposed that man was produced by the mixing of the blood of Belus with earth: and as in ancient and Magian Persia,⁷ where the seed of the man-

dwelt in the earth, under a lake, and were extricated from this abode by the discovery which one of their men made of a hole, through which he ascended to the surface. Here he found a deer, which he carried back with him to his subterraneous habitation; there the deer was killed, and the meat found so good, that all determined to remove to a place where such excellent game was in abundance. The other tribes, rejecting the lake, have the same notions. Among the Iroquois the tradition is, that they dwelt in the earth, where no sun did shine; that Ganawagahha found a hole to get out of the earth at; walking about on the earth, he found a deer, which he took back, and which was found so good, that their mother concluded it best for them all to come out; they did so, and immediately set about planting corn."—From Hukewelder's History of the North American Indians.

² "Les philosophes Egyptiens qui prétendoient que l'homme avoit été formé du limon du Nil."—Fourmont, Anciens Peuples, vol. i, lib. ii, § i, p. 10; and compare Diod. Sic. B. i, § xii.

³ According to the philosophers of India: "The grosser body with which a soul is invested for the purposes of fruition, is composed of five elements, or of four, excluding the ethereal; or of one earth alone, &c."—Colebrooke's Essays, vol. i, p. 245.

⁴ "Le livre Fong-zen-tong dit: Quand le ciel et la terre furent créés, il n'y avait encore ni homme ni peuple. Niu-hoa (the wife and sister of Fou-hi) pétrit de la terre jaune pour en faire l'homme. C'est là la vraie origine du genre humain." Mémoires des Chinoises, vol. i, p. 105.

⁵ Of the inhabitants of Mechoacan, a province of Mexico, we are told: "Ils racontaient que Dieu avoit créé de terre, un homme et une femme, &c." (Hist. Gen. des Voyages.) "Les Yncas Amantas (the learned priest class of Peru) ont cru que l'homme étoit composé d'âme et de corps; que l'âme ne pouvoit être mieux appelée qu'un esprit immortel, et que le corps étoit fait de boue parcequ'il devenoit terre."—Hist. des Yncas, l. ii, c. vii, Garcilasso de Vega.

⁶ Τον δε Βηλον.... κελουσαι ἐνι των θεων την κεφαλην αφελοντι εαντον τω απορρηνεντι αιματι φυρασαι την γην, και διαπλασαι ανθρωπους και θηρια τα δυναμενα τον αερα φερειν."—Berossus, Ant. Frag. Cory, p. 26.

⁷ "Il est dit dans la loi que Kaio-morts ayant rendu en mourant de la semence, cette semence fut purifiée par la lumière du soleil.....Au bout de 40 ans le corps d'un Reivas formant une colonne (un arbre) de 15 ans avec quinze feuilles sortit de la terre. Cet arbre représentoit deux corps disposés de manière que l'un avoit la main dans l'oreille de l'autre, lui étoit uni, lié, faisant

bull, Kaiomorts, sinks into the ground, and grows into the tree Reivas, to which Ormuzd gives life and motion, and of it then forms the first ancestors of mankind. Or, he is generated from the union of beings other than himself, as in the Phœnician cosmogony, where he is the son of the wind Colpias and his wife Baau.⁸ Or, lastly, he is of confessedly unknown origin, as among the Iroquois,⁹ who give the human race one mother, heaven-descended, and six fathers, of whom they narrate many stories, though they know neither how nor whence these first men came into the world. Which of these conjectures is the most rational I will leave others to decide: the voice of mankind, however, seems to be in favour of an earthly origin—and for the same reason probably as was given by the Yncas Amantas of Peru, and which is found also in Genesis: "Man is of earth, because he returns to earth."

But, after having formed man's body, Jehovah Elohim gives that body life. As a father, by inflating, sometimes gives action to the lungs of the new-born, and before seemingly lifeless, infant, so now God breathes "into

un même tout avec lui.....Ormuzd dit qu'il a donné d'abord la main, et ensuite le corps.....qu'il a produit l'action propre au corps, et qu'il a donné le corps pour qu'il fasse son œuvre et passe vive dans cet état. Mais il a donné l'âme d'abord, et ensuite le corps." Boun-Dehesch, § xv, p. 376, vol. ii, Zend.

⁸ "Γεγενεσθαι εκ του Κολπια ανεμου και γυναικος αυτου Βααυ, τουτο δε νυκτα ερμηνευειν, Διωνα και Πρωτογονον ουτω καλουμενους, &c."—Cory's Fragments. I am, nevertheless, aware of Fourmont's conjecture, that the Baau and Colpias of Sanchoniatho are but the Bohu (chaos) and the Rouach (Spiritus Dei) of Moses.

⁹ Iroquois tradition from Lafitau—compare it with that cited above, from Hukewelder: "Dans le commencement il y avoit six

hommes. D'où étoient venus ces hommes? C'est ce qu'ils ne savent pas. Il n'y avoit pas encore de terre; ils erroient au gré du vent; ils n'avoient point non plus de femme, et ils sentoient bien que leur race alloit périr avec eux. Enfin ils apprirent qu'il y en avoit une dans le ciel. Ayant tenu conseil ensemble, il fut résolu que l'un d'eux, nommé Hagouaho, où le loup, s'y transporterait; les oiseaux de concert l'y élevèrent.....Lorsqu'il y fut arrivé, il attendit au pied d'un arbre que cette femme sortit à son ordinaire pour aller puiser de l'eau à une fontaine voisine. La femme ne manqua pas de venir. L'homme lia conversation avec elle et lui fit un présent de graisse d'ours. Elle se laissa séduire, &c."—Lafitau, Mœurs des Sauvages Américains, vol. i. p. 93.

man's nostrils the breath of life, and man becomes a living soul."

I find the "breath of life" applied indiscriminately to all living things: thus, in ch. vi. 7, God says, "I, even I, do bring a flood upon the earth to destroy all flesh wherein is *the breath of life*;" and, again, ch. vii. 22, we are told, "all flesh died, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of creeping thing, and every man, all in whose nostrils was *the breath of the spirit of life*." I conclude, then, that the life which God bestows upon man, is a life which all creatures enjoy in common with man.¹

But man surely has this prerogative, "he becomes a living soul." De Wette has translated this passage, "man becomes a *living being*" (lebendiges Wesen); Michaelis, "*a living animal*" (zum lebendigen Thier). And even supposing that our English Bible has correctly rendered the verse, I find, from Roberts' Illustrations of Scripture, that, in that part of the 20 v. ch. i. which speaks of the creation of the fish of the sea, "as of the moving creatures that have life,"² the Hebrew has for *life*, "soul;" consequently, man, in so far at least as we can learn from this passage, has no pre-eminence over the brute creation.³ Than the brutes of the field he may indeed be wiser

¹ As, according to the Mahomedans (see Koran, c. lxxxix; and Sale's Prel. Dis. p. 111; but compare p. 119), all creatures are to participate in the resurrection; all creatures, like us, have immortal souls, and "breathe the breath of the Spirit of Life;" and the Mahomedans then seemingly interpret this verse as we have done. The Hindoos similarly believe, "That all souls come from Brahme;" and, in the Scanda-Purana, it is recorded, "That souls may be born, as men, beasts, or birds; as grass or trees, or mountains or gods." (Roberts, Illustrations, p. 75.) And the Egyptians, according to Diodorus Sic. B. i., § xii: Πνευμα Διὰ προσαγορευσαι, . . . μεθερμηνευομένης,

της λεξεως, ὃν αιτιον οντα του ψυχικου· τοις ζωοις ενομισαν ὑπαρχειν παντων οἰονει τινα πατερα· συμφωνειν δε τουτους φασι τον επιφανεστατον των παρ' Ἑλλησι ποιητων, επι τον θεον τουτον λεγοντα :

Πατηρ ανδρων τε θεων τε.

² De Wette has rendered "the moving creatures that have life," "Let the waters swarm with fish, living beings" ("Es wimmelte das Wasser von Wasserthieren, lebendigen Wesen"); Michaelis: "Let the waters bring forth abundantly living beasts of the sea" ("Das Wasser bringe allerley lebende Thiere des Wasserreichs hervor").

³ Very evidently the doctrine of Ecclesiastes, chap. iii, 19, 22.

and more powerful; but if he differ from them, it is *in degree* only, and *not in kind*.

"The breath of life." Is not breath an evidence of life, here confounded with life itself, or at least regarded as its cause? And as when this breath, this life, leaves the body, the body returns to its original dust; so, most probably, will, in the eyes of infant man, this breath leave the body⁴ but to return to Him who gave it,—to God.

But man developes and arranges his ideas; and this "breath" loses consequently in time its primary meagre signification, and grows into the mysterious principle of life, the soul.⁵ And for this soul, his individual self, man is very soon compelled by his dearest affections, and the unsatisfied necessities of his moral nature, and the loud voice of reason, to conceive, and claim, and believe in an *individual* existence continued after death.

But again as the soul is a pure emanation⁶ from the great God Himself, it is, in so far at least as its mere existence is concerned, divine, i. e. indestructible, immortal.⁷ And because its present earthly lot depends on the will and pleasure of the Deity, so, therefore, reasons man, will its future immortal state. But the Deity is not, it is also

⁴ Vide Ecclesiast. xii. 7; see also for the Egyptian doctrine, Jablonski, lib. i, c. ii, § 3: "Nempe anima secundum Ægyptios erat το θελον, Divinitas vel Essentia divina, quæ a sede sua veluti delapsa, aliquamdiu per homines et animalia transibat, donec ad pristinum locum rediret." In Otaheite the soul was supposed to be eaten by the Great Spirit. (Vide Cook's first Voyage.)

⁵ The very terms which express the soul are evidence of the originally narrow view which was taken of it: πνευμα, "anima, spiritus, &c."

⁶ With this chapter of Genesis before me, I cannot say that the soul was created, but that it proceeded, was an emanation, from God; and, according to Buddæus:

"Duplici modo potest concipi emanatio; vel ita ut quod emanat, unam eandemque constituat essentiam, vel ita ut ab ea separatur. Priori modo qui emanationem intelligunt in magnum periculum Spinosismi sese conjiciunt, ut qui, posteriori modo capiunt, nihil doceant quod reprehendi debeat." And in this last and orthodox sense I understand the *emanation* of Genesis.

⁷ In the time of Hesiod, the dead, among the Greeks, had already their local habitation, Tartarus. Its *geography* is known, its productions, its inhabitants. In the time of Homer, though the dead have *individual*, they seem to have no *real* existence; they are but shadows flitting in a world of shadows; nothing but memory is left them.

believed, indifferent to human conduct: those who merit His approbation, whom He loves, He rewards with good things; and on those who displease Him He heaps punishment. The soul's immortality then, will be one of happiness or misery, according to the relation of favour or disfavour in which any individual soul stands, or is supposed to stand, to God. How, then, shall we obtain the favour of the Deity? How secure for ourselves eternal happiness, is the great question which occupies our lives, and one which men will answer differently, according to their several conceptions of the Deity.

I. If their Deity be devilish, i. e. malicious, envious,^s as among several of the Aborigenes of South America,

Their state is one of desolation, for thus the proud shade of Achilles rejects the comfort of Ulysses:—

“ I rather wish to be on earth a swain,
Or serve a swain for hire, that scarce can give
Bread to sustain him, than (that life once gone)
Of all the dead sway the imperial throne.”

Chapman, *Odys.* xi, 48.

^s I know not by what *divine* justice and injustice of the *Devill*,” says Purchas, “it comes to passe that God hath given some men up so farre unto the Devill's tyrannie, that he hath banished out of their hearts the knowledge and worship of the true God; and yet the nature of man cannot be without apprehension of some greater and more excellent nature; and rather than want all religion, they will have a religious-irreligious commerce with the Devill. Yea, the more all knowledge of God is banished, the baser service doe men, in doing and suffering, yield to the Devill; as it falleth out in these regions, Nova Francia.”—*Pilgrimage*, p. 629. Similarly the mountaineers of India, to the west of Meissour, according to Dubois (*Mœurs des Indes*, vol. ii, p. 441), have no other divinity than the devil: “Tous les maux, toutes les contrariétés qu'ils éprouvent, sont imputés à leurs boutams, dont ils

croient s'être attiré la haine, et c'est pour les calmer qu'ils se montrent si dévots envers eux.” In Africa: “Les nègres de Guinée font encore des sacrifices au Diable.”—*Conformité des Coutumes des Indes Orientales avec celles des Juifs*, &c. p. 155. The Caribbees also worship or sacrifice to their gods only to stay their anger: “In dem sie sie fast grössten Theils für feindselige Wesen halten.”—*Sitten der Wilden*, vol. ii, p. 53. The Antis worshipped snakes and tigers: “à cause de leur cruauté” (*Histoire des Yncas*, p. 204); and the natives of Virginia, “all things that are able to hurt them beyond their prevention, and chiefly the Devil” (*Purchas*, p. 639); and among the Greeks, the gods are shown us as seeking occasion to destroy rich and powerful families: “Ὡς Αἰσχυλος μεγει... ὅτι θεος μὲν αἰτίαν φυνε βροτοῖς ὅταν κακῶσαι δῶμα παμπηδὴν θελῇ” (*Plato de Rep.* lib. ii, vol. vi, Bib., and *Herod.* vol. vii, p. 46);

and some of the savages of Africa, then men pray to their God but to propitiate his wrath, and make him offerings only to turn away his envy. Their religion is one of fear, and their worship is adulation; their morality, too, is at the best but selfish and prudential, and, as a rule of conduct, holds subordinate place to what they consider their religious service, i. e. to those acts and ceremonies which they believe will gain for them the favour of their Deity.⁹ Like Eastern slaves, or the degraded Romans under the rule of Tiberius, they readily tread under foot the most sacred duties of Humanity. They scruple at no baseness, they hesitate at no crime, so long as his privy-council assures them that they stand well with their idol.

II. If their Deity be *anthropopathick*, i. e. if kindness, benevolence be His characteristic; then, as their Deity loves His creatures, He will desire their good, and teach them how to ensure it. But, as He is human, individual, He will teach them not by revelations made to man, the great books of nature and of experience, but by special revelations made to nations, or to individuals, as the Vedas, the Zend, the Old Testament, the Koran, &c. And these revelations will be:

1st. *As the Deity is good*—of moral precepts, which

and among the Romans we know the proverb, "*Quem Deus vult perdere,*" &c.

⁹ Of the negroes of the Gold Coast we are told: "*Ils regardent la mort comme le plus terrible de tous les châtimens; c'est cette crainte qui enflamme leur zèle dans toutes les affaires de religion, et qui les rend si fidèles à leurs engagemens d'abstinence. Le meurtre, l'adultère et le vol ne passent point parmi eux pour des grands crimes, parcequ'ils peuvent être expiés avec une somme d'argent; au lieu que les fautes qui blessent la religion ne peuvent être si parfaitement effacés qu'il n'en reste quelque tache.*"—Hist. Gén. des Voyages,

vol. iv, p. 160. See also the Euthyphron of Plato, and the account of the persecution of the Albigenses, Sismondi, *Histoire des Français*, 12th and 13th centuries; remember too the child-sacrifices to Moloch, frequently alluded to in Scripture, an awful instance of which, as offered by the Carthaginians, is mentioned by Diodorus Sic. (vol. ix, lib. xx, c. xiv, p. 40, Bip.); and the atonement of Amestris, the wife of Xerxes, who, according to Herodotus, buried alive twelve Persian youths to appease the anger of the gods. See also Levit. xxvii. 28, 29; and Deut. xxi. 18; not forgetting Jephtha's daughter.

will appear as the commands of God for the rule of man's conduct through life.

And 2ndly. *As He is great*—of those rites and ceremonies with which He desires His worshippers to approach Him.

Hence then a religion, moral and ritual, which is not without hope, not without grandeur, but which too much regards particulars; which dwells *less* upon general and immutable laws, *and more* upon those of custom, or expedience, or prejudice; which delights in non-essentials, and idolizes its peculiar tenets; which magnifies differences, especially formal ones; and which, though perhaps tolerant, is exclusive and sectarian. But such a religion is also human; it is, therefore, progressive; it advances with man's mind, and daily loses some littleness; and daily, notwithstanding all opposition of interest and bigotry, approaches to a rational and universal religion.

But, again, as man's eternal happiness or misery is determined by his conduct upon earth, so the character of that happiness or misery depends upon the notions which he entertains of the soul's nature. Thus, when the soul is sensual, or a subtler body only, the heaven or hell imagined will be material and sensual also, though the man's conceptions of it will vary according to the tastes and habits of different nations. Such was the heaven of the ancient Germans, the inhabitants of which were to gain continued victories, and feast nightly in the halls of Odin.¹ Such is that, also, of the American Indian,² who hopes eternally

¹ In Valhalla: "Der Einhern Zeitvertreib wird täglich dieser seyn. Wenn sie sich an dem Hydromel satt getrunken, und alle am Tage bekleidet seyn, so gehen sie zusammen in einen Zirkel und in einen Garten aus; sie kämpfen sich, und sehen ob einer den andern niederlegen und besiegen kann. So bald sie aber zum Mittagsmahl geruffen werden, so laufen sie geschwinde alle unbeschädigt

nach Heim, und setzen sich alle zum trinken dahin, wo des Odins grosses Herrnhaus ist."—Edd. xx Parabel. Schimmellman.

² "Concerning the religion in these parts of Canada, even among the savages, we find some tracks and foot-prints thereof, which neither the dreadful winters have quite frozen to death, nor these great and deep waters have wholly drowned, but that some shadowe

to hunt in prairies where game never fails. Such that of several Eastern people, who dream of gardens, cool with gentle breezes, and beautiful with trees, and shrubs, and flowers, and ever playing fountains. And such, too, that of the Judaical Christian, who revels in a golden city, the new Jerusalem, where is ever heard the deep chaunt of crowned saints, and the "enchanting ravishment" of seraphic harps.

But when the soul of man is *animal*;³ when man has not been so much struck by the differences, as the similarities, between himself and the animal creation, and has therefore made no distinction between his soul and the soul of beasts; when *his soul is life merely*, independent of all self-consciousness: then, as he must grant, if he would be consequent, to all other souls the same immortality he claims for his own, and as he is not prepared to allow to inferior creatures the same merit and the same heaven⁴ as to himself: he will either imagine a grade of heavens, each allotted to particular grades of excellence; or he will have recourse to a succession of births and deaths,⁵ according to which, the souls of animals inhabit at

thereof appeareth in these shadows of men, however wilde and savage, like to them which give her entertainment. This people believeth, saith Jaques Cartier, in one, which they call Cudruaigni, who, say they, often speaks to them, and tells them what weather will follow, whether good or bad. Moreover, when he is angry with them he casts dust into their eyes. They believe that when they die they go into the stars, and thence by little and little descend downe into the horizon, even as the stars doe, after which they goe into certaine greene fields, full of goodly faire and precious trees, and flowers, and fruits."—Purchas his Pilgrimage, B. viii, c. iv, p. 627.

³ As in Ecclesiastes (iii. 18, 22). These two views of the soul may very well, and do often, co-exist to-

gether in one and the same creed, and in one and the same nation. The first is the more rude; it is the mere instinct of immortality declaring itself, giving itself body, shape. The second is more refined; man has thought a little, reasoned a little; he has perceived that some part of him is perishable, and he has gone on abstracting something, till all individual immortality is destroyed.

⁴ The Mahommedans have cut the Gordian knot. After they have called up and judged the brute creation, they change them all into dust, except the dog of the seven sleepers and Ezra's ass, which, by a peculiar favour, are admitted into paradise.—Sale's Koran, Prel. Dis. p. 119.

⁵ This system accordingly prevailed in Egypt (Herod. vol. ii, p.

length the bodies of men, and thence, *if they have done well*, are removed to heaven,⁶ *and, if evil*, are sent back again to some animal form—to the system, in a word, of metempsychosis, or, more properly, of metensomatosis.⁷ This system is, however, especially faulty: its immortality is mere perpetuity of existence; an immortality of the soul, and not of the person, of individual life broken up into many parts, and not of one and the same individual consciousness moulding these parts into one continuous whole.

Verses 8-14. These verses contain the site and description of the garden of Eden. They present to us the habitable world as a large plain bounded by four great rivers, which had their source⁸ eastward, in Eden, the birth-place of the human race, and described as a garden containing every thing that could satisfy the wants, or gratify the fancy of its inhabitants.

For Eden, as a terrestrial paradise, we may find parallels in the splendid fables of the Greeks,⁹ the enchanted gardens

123; and Jablonski, *Pant. Ægypt.* c. ii); also among the Jews, according to Josephus (*De Bel. Jud. lib. ii*; and *Antiq. lib. xviii, c. ii*); and still prevails among the Hindoos: "The Orientals believe that the vital principle in animals will never die, and when the life or soul has separated from the body, it is said to enter into and animate another." —Roberts' *Illust. of Scripture*, p. 2.

⁶ That is, those who have done well in the highest form of Humanity. Thus, in the Veda, says Wilkins, note ⁴⁵ to the Bhagavat, "it is declared that the souls of women and of the inferior brutes are doomed to transmigration till they can be regenerated in the body of a Brahmin." This miserable exclusiveness is, however, rejected by the Bhagavat itself: "Those men who may be of the womb of sin, women, the tribes of Visya and Sudra, shall go the supreme journey if they take sanctuary with me."—Sect. iv, close.

⁷ Among the North American Indians this system shows itself in its simplest, most harmless, and most affectionate form. They, according to Chateaubriand, lay the dead bodies of their infants near some frequented fountain, in the hope that their women may drink in the fluttering souls.

⁸ Thus, in the Persian sacred books, the fountain Ardousour, "The Palace of Rivers," rising in the midst of the mountain Albordj, is carried over the earth in a thousand channels. See Neresch Ardousour, Vendidad Sade, Ha lxviii, vol. i, p. 246; and also Boun-Dehesch, vol. ii, p. 368, § xiii. Zend. So also in Chinese mythology, four rivers flow from the mountain Kouen-lun to the four quarters of the world.—Prelim. Dis. to Chouking, p. 128, by De Guignes.

⁹ The gardens of the Hesperides, the Isle of Leuce, &c.

of the Chinese,¹ the Eerienne-Veedjoo of the Persians,² and the holy Meru³ of the Hindus. With man's innocence and happiness there, we may compare the reigns of the gods and demigods in Egypt and Phœnicia,⁴ of Djem-

"¹ Au milieu du sommet de la montagne Kouan-lun est un jardin où un doux zephyr souffle sans cesse et agite les feuilles des beaux arbres Tong, dont il est entouré. Ce jardin enchanté est placé auprès de la porte fermée du ciel: les eaux qui l'arrosent sont la source jaune qui est la plus élevée et la plus abondante, elle s'appelle *la fontaine de l'immortalité*; ceux qui en boivent ne meurent plus. Cette fontaine se divise en quatre fleuves. Ces quatre fleuves sont les fontaines du Seigneur Esprit (Ty-Chin); c'est par elles qu'il prépare des remèdes à tout," &c. Hoai-nantsee du Paradis Terrestre des Tassees.—Mém. Chinoises, vol. i, p. 106. The Chan-hai-king also describes this garden, but with a difference: "On y trouve tout ce qu'on peut désirer, il y a des arbres admirables et des sources merveilleuses.—Il est appelé le jardin fermé et caché, le jardin suspendu, le doux ouvrage des fleurs—la vie est sortie de là; c'est le chemin du ciel, mais, c'étoit au fruit de l'arbre qu'étoit attaché la conservation de la vie."—La glose le nomme *l'arbre de la vie*."—Ibid.

² "Ormuzd dit à Sapetman Zoroaster: J'ai donné, O Sapetman, un lieu de délices et d'abondance, personne n'en peut donner un pareil. Ce lieu est Eerienne-Veedjoo, qui étoit plus beau que le monde entier qui existe (par ma puissance). Le premier lieu, la (première) ville semblable au Behescht que je produisis, moi qui suis Ormuzd, fut Eerienne-Veedjoo, donné pur. Ensuite ce Peétiaré-Ahriman plein de mort fit dans le fleuve qui arrosoit Eerienne-Vadjo, la grande cou-

leuvre (mère) de l'hiver donné par les Dews (1. Fargard. Vendidad. Zend. vol. i, p. 263) This Eerienne-Veedjoo is also called Hedenesch in the Boun-Dehesch; this, with the great serpent that destroys its beauty, induced me to suppose it might be the same as Eden; but it is a town, and not a garden; and the first habitation of the Persian people, and not that of Meschia and Meschiane, the Adam and Eve of the Zend-Avesta.

³ "There is a fair and stately mountain, and its name is Meroo, a most exalted mass of glory, reflecting the sunny rays from the splendid surface of its gilded horns. It is clothed in gold, and is the respected haunt of Dews and Gandharvas. It is inconceivable, and not to be encompassed by sinful man; and it is guarded by dreadful serpents. Many celestial medicinal plants adorn its sides, and it stands piercing the heavens with its aspiring summit,—a mighty hill, inaccessible even to the human mind! It is adorned with trees and pleasant streams, and resoundeth with the delightful songs of birds." From the Mahabharat, by Wilkins, notes to Bhagavat, p. 146; and see, also, Wilford on the Nile, Asiatic Researches, vol. iii. p. 200; and an account of the four paradises of India and their different joys, in Dubois Mœurs des Indes, vol. ii, p. 414.

⁴ From Egypt and Phœnicia are, I presume, borrowed the "Saturnia Regna" of Greece. Then men lived happy as the gods; without care, without labour, ever young, in continued enjoyment. Vide Hesiod's Opp. p. 109 et seq.

schid⁵ in Persia, the Age of Virtue⁶ in China, and the "Saturnia Regna," the Golden Age, of Greece. But Eden, as both the paradise of the trees of life and knowledge, and the birth-place and nursery of mankind, stands alone, and exists only in the mythology of the Hebrews.

In Eden grows every tree pleasant to the sight and good for food. *In the first chapter*, man's first food was of fruit and herbs bearing seed; *in this*, it seems to have been of fruit alone. And, if we consider: on the one side, the agreeable flavour of fruit, and the ease with which it may in general be obtained: and, on the other, the nature of corn, which nowhere grows in any abundance without cultivation, and which, to be *edible*, requires some, and, to be *pleasant and wholesome*, considerable, preparation: we may safely conclude, that man originally lived on fruit, and any succulent roots, and that hunger and necessity alone first drove him to taste corn; and that much observation and long experience were requisite to teach him its superior qualities as an article of food.

"The tree of life." In the legends⁷ of the Chinese, we hear sometimes of a fountain of immortality, at others, of a tree of life. And in the heaven of Indra, so the Hindu mythology teaches, is "a tree which sprang from the Amur-

⁵ Vide Fargard ii; Vend. vol. i, p. 271, Zend. Then: "Il n'y avoit aucun chef, de loin ni de près, qui commandât avec dureté; il n'y avoit ni mendiant, ni imposteur qui portât au culte des Dews; ni ennemi caché, ni homme violent, ni dent cruelle. On n'y séparoit pas les hommes les uns des autres. Les femmes n'y étoient pas sujettes aux tems critiques dont Ahriman a affligé le genre humain."—P. 176.

⁶ Thus described by Tchoang-tsee: "Tout croissait partout de soi-même. On étoit partout chez soi; les animaux assemblés en troupeaux, erroient ça et là dans la campagne; les oiseaux voloient en troupes de tous côtés, et tous les fruits de la terre naissoient

d'eux-mêmes. L'homme habitoit au milieu des bêtes, l'univers n'étoit qu'une famille. On cultivoit la vertu sans le secours de la sciencerien ne pouvoit être funeste ni donner la mort. Quoique l'homme eu des connoissances, il n'avoit pas occasion d'en faire usage."—Mémoires Chinoises, vol. i, p. 177. The author of the tract, "sur l'Antiquité des Chinois," from which this is taken, asserts that Tchoang-tsee lived before Yao. Unless the translator has paraphrased the words of his author, the style is a very extraordinary one for that age. Compare it with the conversational and dramatic tone of the Kings.

⁷ See note¹, page 72.

nam, which was churned by the gods; and those in the heavenly world, who eat of its fruit, have immortality, and whatsoever they⁸ desire." The Zend, too, tells us of a tree growing in the fountain Ardouisour, the white hom, the juice of which gives immortality, while its touch, at the resurrection, will render life to the dead.⁹ These fountains of immortality, these trees of life, I cannot, however, a moment compare with the tree in Eden; they are like the dreams of poets, or of alchymists; they but express the heart's wishes, perhaps its hopes, while this appears as an historical fact, to which are knit the misery and misfortunes of mankind.¹

⁸ Roberts, *Illustrations of Scriptures*, p. 5; and *Mœurs des Indes*, Dubois, vol. ii, p. 425. According to the Oupnekhat: "In illo Paradiso duo fluvii magni sunt; et illud stagnum *Kothr* plenum e vino est, illo modo (tali) vino, quod, quicumque illud comedit (bibit) in læto statu ebrius efficiatur; et in illo Paradiso arbor (*pilpel*) est, quod ab illa aqua vitæ stellat."—Duperron's Translation, vol. i, p. 85.

⁹"Près de ces arbres est le Hom blanc qui donne la santé, qui fait concevoir, il croit dans la source de l'eau Ardounissour. Quiconque en boira (du jus) de cet (arbre) ne mourra pas. On l'appelle l'arbre Gokeren, comme il est dit: Le Hom qui éloigne la mort, à la résurrection rendra la vie aux morts."—Boun-Dehesch, vol. ii, § xxvii, p. 404, Zend. This Hom, this tree of Life, like the tree in Eden, is to be found in Paradise alone. There the resemblance ends. The Hom receives its name and power from Hom, its preserving Spirit; from Hom, the worshipper of Ormuzd; the first who revealed his life and health-giving law to man; from Hom, physician and priest; "Hom, great and victorious, and beautiful; the fount of health and plenty; the king who treads evil under foot, and annihilates the Daroudj."—

Zend. vol. ii, p. 301. The virtues of the tree Hom are derived, and seem but symbolical of him to whom it is consecrated; while those of the Tree of Life in Eden are its natural property. With the Hom juice of the Parsis, Von Bohlen compares the Kusa-grass and Soma-plant of the Hindoos.

¹ To the Tree of Knowledge I know no parallel; for I cannot compare with it that Well of Wisdom in the Northern Mythology, from which even the Universal Father, Odin himself, deigns to drink, and whence the all-knowing Mimer, draws his science. Under the roots of the great Ash-tree, whose boughs extend through the world and reach to heaven: "Ist die Quelle Mimis, in welcher die Weisheit verborgen ist. Der Herr von diesem Brunnen heist Mimer. Er ist mit aller Art der Weisheit überschwenglich erfüllt; weil er alle Morgen das Wasser aus dieser Quelle, durch die Giallhorn trinket. Eines Tages kam der All-Vater, und bath sich einen Trunk davon aus, aber er konnte es nicht eher erlangen, bis er eines von seinen Augen zum Pfande gesetzt. Wie denn davon in der Voluspä also gesagt ist: Odin! Odin! wo hast du dein eines Auge gelassen? ist es nicht in der reinen Mimis-Quelle?"

Verses 15-17. In Eden, with his wants abundantly supplied, and with an occupation at once his duty and his delight—in itself sufficient to make of any barren heath a paradise—that man was happy I can well conceive. He was happy—no contemptible blessing as the world goes;—but his happiness I see no reason to adorn with those high moral and intellectual qualities which we are so eager to heap on our first great ancestor.² I find no trace of them in the story. On the contrary, the duties assigned him there,—and as they are assigned him by God, they surely are the true measure of his powers³—are simple, childlike. Examine, for instance, the one prohibitory command, by the observance of which, man holds his tenure of life and happiness: is it not one which demands simple obedience merely, and which enforces that obedience by the threat of punishment? is it not just such an one as a father would impose upon his child, who knew not good and evil, and with whom, as no reasons were valid, punishment alone could avail? Does it not show man to have been ignorant as well as innocent? or, rather, does it not make man's innocence to depend upon his ignorance?

But if man was thus ignorant of good and evil, how could God threaten him with punishment? For with the conception of a punishment is involved the idea of some evil: and the very threat of punishment, therefore, when rational, presupposes in the being threatened with it, a capacity to choose between, and consequently a knowledge of, good and evil;—how, then, can that knowledge be said to have been attached to the fruit of the fatal tree?

Alle Morgen kehret Mimer in dem süßen Hydromel, dieses theure Pfand um, und schmecket den Meth, weil das theure Pfand darin ist."—Edd. viii, Parab. Schimmelman.

² It would be easy to fill many pages with the extravagant and absurd conjectures on which various divines, from the Rabbins downwards, have ventured. But why waste time on these follies? Him

who has the time to waste I refer to Bayle, Arts. *Adam*, *Eve*; D'Herbelot, Bib. Orient., Art. *Adam*; Eisenmenger Entdecktes Judenthum, lib. xlviii, p. 365; Bartolocc. Bib. Rab. vol. i, p. 65, 78.

³ Unless, indeed, like the Chinese, (see note⁶, p. 73, *infra*) we give him a knowledge and a power of which he has no need.

Again, the punishment with which man is threatened is death. "Thou shalt surely die." What? have we, *a priori*, a conception of death? Can we know what death is but by seeing its effects? One of two things, then,—either the Deity, if He spake intelligibly to Adam, revealed to him what death was: or Adam had seen animals die. In *the latter case*, (the most probable, for *the former* supposes revelation upon revelation), death was not excluded from paradise. Already, bird, beast, or creeping thing, had been seen by man, lifeless, motionless. Already death had appeared an object of terror, and not, therefore, as a calm and eternal sleep, but attended with all the convulsions of pain, and followed by a putrid rottenness. Already, then, death had taught man the pain of disgust,—and even in paradise he had fears.

But again this command is also indicative of our⁴ author's notions of the Deity. And, as it is not a moral command; as it is no way linked to any of those great laws which, though perhaps not clearly seen, nor even divined, are the basis of man's moral life, it is not the command of a purely moral God, i. e. of one before whom all moral, is the highest, excellence. And, as it is a command substantiated by no possible reason; as it stands before us like Gessler's hat, or Caligula's horse, to be bowed to, obeyed, as one of those whims and caprices with which mere power frets and tortures, or asserts its superiority over those who are subject to its will;⁵ it is the command, I will not say, of

⁴ Throughout, I regard these books as *human* productions: did I view them as divine, I should no more dare to criticise them than I do the great book of providence shewn us in the fate and fortunes of mankind, and in our own lives, in every page of which we so distinctly trace the finger of God, that we never raise a cry against the justice of events which we understand not.

⁵ I must own that the experience of Boysen no way surprises me: "Bei Uebelthatern, die er in

beträchtlicher Anzahl zu besuchen bekam, hat er gefunden, dass die meisten von dem Vorurtheile eingenommen waren, dass die Gesetze Gottes sich bloss auf absolute Gewalt gründen, Gott nur nach Gewalt und willkürlichen Einfällen handle, und weder von Weisheit noch Güte geleitet werde, sie folglich nicht wider ein reines moralisches Princip, sondern wider ein unerbittliches Muss gesündigt hätten, und daher ihr Verbrechen und Strafen als Zufall und Verhängniss betrachten müssten, dem

an irrational God, but of one whose laws are not necessary and universal, and who is himself an individual and limited, rather than a rational and universal, being.

Verses 18, 19. The fowls of the air, *here* formed out of earth, are, *in the first chapter*, said to be the production of water. And the creation of animals, which *there* precedes, and is independent of that of man, is *here* posterior to, and consequent upon it. In both chapters, however, dominion is given to man; in the first *expressly*, in the second, by *implication* only, God brings the animal creation to Adam, "to see what he would call them, and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof."

"Adam." The word, which our translators have rendered Adam, some commentators suppose not to be a proper name,⁶ but merely the generic term *man*, which, with the article ΗΕ prefixed to it, an article never found with proper names in Hebrew, signifies, "the man." Its root, according to Josephus, means red-coloured;⁶ Michaelis and Bruns,⁷ however, conceive that a dark-brown or olive is rather intended by it, and that it alludes to the supposed complexion of the first man, or rather to the complexion of the people among whom this fragment originated.⁸

nicht auszuweichen gewesen." Boysen's Lebensbeschreibung, Recension.—Götting. Bib. Theol. Lit. v. Schleusner and Staüdlin, vol. ii, pp. 417, 418. And what, after all, is Paley's Moral Philosophy, but a morality founded on the same views of God?

⁶ Κατα γλωτταν' Εβραιων, πυρρος, επιδηπερ απο της πυρρας γης φρασθεισης εγεγονει.—Jos. Antiq. book i, § ii; and see other explanations given to the name in Glossii Philol. Sac. C. de Ling. Hebraic. p. 514.

⁷ Bruns über d. ältest. Sagen und Entsteh. d. Mensch.—Paulus Neues Reper. für Biblisch. Lit. vol. ii, p. 202.

⁸ Vide Bruns, ut supra. Thus the red Indians will have it that man

was formed out of red caly, while the sallow Chinese knead him out of yellow earth. See note ⁴, p. 63.

We may observe, also, that in the Hebrew there is a sort of pun on the creation of man—God formed Adam out of Adamah. Either then, the name of the first man known, may have led to the legend of the matter of which man was formed, or the supposed matter of which the man was formed to his name. We find exactly the same thing in northern mythology: the first pair were made out of the branches of two trees by the gods; vide v. d. Hagens Nordische Helden, vol. v; Norna Gests-Saga, chap. v. p. 139, note. And the Edda thus recounts their creation; "After the sons of Bor had formed

Verse 20. "Then Adam gave names to all cattle." Though the invention of names is by the Chinese ascribed as a high honour to the first and most revered of their sovereigns, Fo-hi¹, and was, by some of the ancient philosophers,² regarded as an evidence of the highest wisdom,—it seems to me one of the earliest and most necessary results of the power, possessed by a rational creature, of producing articulate sounds. For children, we find, instinctively give names to the objects which most interest them. We know, too, that while man may by cries and signs make known his wants and affections, he is wholly unable to denote to others any external object, not immediately present, but by some common and intelligible word.³ The course of nature, therefore, and the necessity of the case, seem to show us that names were man's first essays in speech, and that to these were in time added those words which express passion or affection,—verbs. The materials of language were then within his grasp; but who shall say how many generations must have passed away ere he learned to bind these materials together—ere he was able to build them up into phrases? and how many other generations, ere these phrases, necessarily so uncouth and cumbersome in their origin, could, by the use of inflexions, or the addition of particles, be filed down and polished

earth, sea, and sky, out of the body of the giant Ymer, 'Sie gingen eintsmals am Ufer spatziren, und fanden zwey Hölzer, die nahmen sie in die Hände und machten daraus Menschen, einen Mann Ask, und Einen Weibchen, EMBLA.'"
(v. Parabel, Schimmelman's trans.) Mone (in his *Gesch. des Heidenthums in nord. Europa*, vol. i, § lxiv, p. 343) explains these names of the first pair: "*Askr*" as "*Esche*," *ash*; and, "*Embla*" as "*Eller*," *alder*.

⁹ Man lived therefore in innocent fellowship with the beasts of the field. Such, at his origin, he is described in some of the Chinese legends. "Il est dit dans le Lou-

se et le Vaiki que dans l'antiquité les hommes se cachèrent au fond des antres et peuploient les déserts; qu'ils vivoient en société avec toutes les créatures; et que ne pensant pas à faire aucun mal aux bêtes, celles-ci ne songeoient pas à les offenser," (Chou-king, par de Guignes, Pref. p. 82), *i. e.* man lived a beast among beasts.

¹ Fohi, according to the Chinese, first gives names to plants and animals.

² "Qui primus nomina, quod summæ sapientiæ Pythagoræ visum est, omnibus rebus imposuit?"—Cicero *Tusc. Quæst.*, lec. i, § xxv.

³ The making the object known, by drawing it, is put out of the

into more courtly and serviceable proportions? and, arrived at this, how far is man even yet from those formulary expressions, those abstract terms,⁴ into which are crowded and condensed whole volumes of thought? Our histories of language, like our histories of mankind, begin in the middle.

Verses 21-25. This myth (relating to the creation of woman), while it accounts for, seems to rest upon, certain Hebrew idioms. Thus woman derives her name from man, because she was taken out of man; and the wife is said to be bone of her husband's bone, and flesh of his flesh, because the first woman was made of the first man's rib. Would it not, however, be more rational to presume that the idioms and the etymologies are the origin of, and fully account for, the myth? That because the word *Soha* (woman), was derived from *Soh* (man), that, therefore (and the reasoning⁵ is quite in accordance

question, as belonging to a later and more advanced state of society.

⁴ Terms with which many nations are yet unacquainted: "La langue de Peron," says Condamine, "manque de termes pour exprimer les idées universelles, preuve évidente du peu de progrès qu'ont fait les esprits de ces peuples. Temps, durée, espace, être, substance, matière, corps, tous ces mots et beaucoup d'autres n'ont pas d'équivalent dans leurs langues; non-seulement les noms des êtres métaphysiques, mais ceux des êtres moraux ne peuvent se rendre chez eux qu'imparfaitement et par de longues périphrases. Il n'y a pas de mot propre qui réponde exactement à ceux de vertu, justice, liberté, reconnaissance, ingratitude."—Voy. à la Riv. des Amazons.

⁵ Several instances of tales founded upon names, and afterwards related to account for those names, are given in Pashley's Travels in Crete; see also the Theseus and Romulus of Plutarch. Several,

too, may be found in the Edda, Parabel xviii (Schimmelman's Translation). One, which accounts for a name given to the wrist, I shall subjoin: "Es geschahe einstens dass die Aeser den Wolff Fenris an sich locken wollten, um, dass sie ihn mit dem Fuss-eisen, Gleipner, gutwillig binden mögten; aber, als er Ihnen nicht trauen wollte, weil er glaubte, dass, wenn sie ihn einmal gebunden und gefasset hätten, sie ihn nicht so wieder frey würden davon gehen lassen; und daher, jemandes Hand in seinen Rachen als einen Unterpfand gestickt haben wolte; so war dieser Gott Tyr so tapfer und groszmüthig dass er ihn die rechte Hand zum Pfand in den Rachen steckte; und da die Aeser den gefesselten Wolff Fenris nicht wieder losketten wollten, so bis ihm der Wolff Fenris die eine Hand ab an dem Ort der bis diese Stunde Wolffs-Lidur heist."—Parab. xiv. And see also the account of the Indian Deluge, from the Padma Purana

with the views of an infant and wonder-loving people), the woman was said to have been taken out of man? and, because the wife left her father's house, and became one family with her husband, because she was considered (as among the Hindus at this day⁶) as his half,—as his side,—flesh of his flesh; that, therefore, the woman was said to have been formed of the rib of the man?⁷

If now we compare this myth with the corresponding narrative in the first chapter, we find, that *there* man and woman are created simultaneously, and then sent forth to increase and multiply, i. e. to fulfil one of the animal laws of their species; and, *here*, that the woman is created for the man,—but created for him, not as the slave of his will, an instrument of his pleasures, but as his helpmeet, his companion, his equal; she is created to stand by the side of man,—a wife,⁸ i. e. that the law of the species is here limited, and becomes a law to the individual.

His instincts urge man to the satisfaction of his desires, and in the satisfaction of them he finds enjoyment; but,

(in Asiatic Researches, vol. i p. 230), and of the birth of Sagara and the etymology of his name, in the Ramayuna, vol. i, taken from Rhode ü. rel. Bildung d. Hindus, vol. i, p. 168.

⁶ See Digest of Hindoo Law, vol. iii, p. 458. The same idea must have prevailed among the Persians (vide their account of the origin of Man, c. ii, note ⁹, p. 63), and also among all those nations with whom the first man was androgine; an opinion adopted by Plato in his Symposium, vol. x, p. 260, Bipont.

⁷ In the Oupnekhat, vol. ii, chap. cxlviii, p. 294, is a legend (the names of its personages are very evidently not Indian, but Perso-Mahometan) which speaks of the creation of woman not very dissimilarly from Genesis. After having routed the Djeniare, or devils, the Fereschtehha, or angels, did not give to Brahme the glory of the victory. Brahme, to bring them to

a true sense of their weakness, puts on the form of Adam (cum figurâ mirabilem *rov* Adam apparens fuit), and puzzles the Fereschtehha by his questions. They address themselves to Andr, their king. But Adam hides away, and Andr in his place finds a woman, (quod nomen ejus Adama fuit); and afterwards we are informed that Brahme, "quod cum figurâ Adam (hominis mirandi apparens fuerat, et *è* volitione ejus *ñ* Adama producta reddita fuerat."

⁸ The Chinese make Fou-hi the inventor, not of marriage exactly, but of the marriage ceremonies, "Avant Fou-hi il n'y avoit point de mariage déterminé; il établit une manière de contracter cette union et des cérémonies pour constater la réalité. Il assigna à chacun des époux des devoirs particuliers à remplir, et par ces moyens il établit des règles de bienséance et des mœurs."—Mém. Chin. vol. iii. p. 9.

from experience, he learns, that to ensure a continued well-being, he must enjoy moderately; that he must not so much press his desires, as be pressed by them, to enjoyment; and, from reason, that these his desires must not at all interfere, or interfere the least possible, with the desires of others. His conduct in life, then, is determined by laws *physical, prudential, and rational*, and it is his duty to find *the harmony of these laws*. But *that harmony*, when found, constitutes the code of Humanity, the code of God to man; and to facilitate the observance of its several precepts *is*, or should be, the chief end and object of the machinery of civil society. Now all the conditions of this *human or divine* code, in so far as the sexual instincts are concerned, society has satisfied by the *institution of marriage*.⁹ Marriage then, speaking generally, is advantageous to the individual, not only because it renders him a happier, but also because it makes him a better, man.¹ For, if forgetting that self-denial and self-command are but means, the man seek to stifle the demands and instincts of nature: if he shut himself up in an ascetic or religious morality:² then (and I suppose him a man of inflexible purpose) the never-failing watchfulness which he must keep over himself, the continued self-restraint to which he is a slave, give to his character a harshness and rigidity which gradually unfit him for the sympathies of social life. He lives alone, unloving and unloved; soured in temper, he broods over his systems, till they become a

⁹ Marriage, as it exists in Christian countries, without determining, however, how far, and on what grounds, the marriage contract is, or should be, dissoluble.

¹ If, generally, marriage does not effect all this, we may rest assured that there is some vice in the machinery of society, which should be diligently looked for, and, at any price, radically cured.

² It is this morality which drives the monk to the cloister, and the hermit to the desert. St. Anthony may roll himself in snow, may tear his flesh with pincers, or macerate it with rods; but even with the

book of God before his eyes, the luxurious forms of fair women trouble his attention, dreams at night torment him; he may be continent, but he is unchaste. What then is the fate of those whom fear, or a thousand other causes, compel to abstinence?...The abnormal developments of the sexual instinct it is not my business to trace out; who would see a fearful instance of them, I refer to Scipio di Ricci's examination of the nuns in a convent at Fiesole; and who would know their terrible consequences, to Burdach's *Physiologie*, lib. viii, § 565.

fanaticism; and he dies happy, if he dies sane. If, on the other hand, he neglect or despise the laws of prudence,—if he give himself up to all sensual indulgence, and seek out new pleasures to whet a blunted appetite,—then, a prey to all nervous disorders, with a diseased body, a degraded intellect, and an imbecile will, he drags out an idiotic existence, an old man in the prime of life. Or, if he merely disregard the rational law,—if callous and selfish, he know no law but his own lusts,—then, however rich, healthy, and honoured he may be, he is a bad man, and, such is my faith, a miserable one.

Verse 23: “And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.” So also the Chinese describe the first created, as inhabiting the fields, clothed in their innocence alone, the true children of the Tien.³ But if to be naked and not ashamed be to be innocent, what shall we say to the maidens of Bissao,⁴ whose bodies, although sometimes painted, are always without clothing? What to the Caribbees,⁵ who ridiculed as a folly the mere notion of covering that which nature had left bare? What to the ancient Peruvians, before the time of Manco Capac, whom Garcilasso de la Vega, on the authority of an old Ynca, describes as not knowing how to cultivate the earth,⁶ nor how to prepare wool or cotton to make for

³ “Quand l’homme fut créé (dit le livre Lieou-chou-tsin-ouen) il n’y avoit point encore d’habits; il habitoit dans les campagnes, couvert de sa seule innocence, et étoit vraiment le fils du Tien.”—Mémoires des Chinoises, vol. i, p. 199.

⁴ “Les filles de Bissao sont entièrement nues; si leur naissance est distinguée, elles ont le corps marqué de fleurs et d’autres figures, ce qui fait paroître leur peau comme une pièce de satin travaillée.”—Histoire des Voyages, vol. iii, p. 380.

⁵ Of the Caribbees: “So wohl Männer als Weiber gehen ganz nackend...sie sagen das sie nackend aus Mutter-Leibe kämen; so wäre

es eine Thorheit den Leib den sie von der Natur blos bekommen hätten mit Kleidern zu bedecken.”—Sitten der Wilden, vol. ii, p. 21.

⁶ “Les hommes de ce temps-là, tels que les bêtes, étoient sans police and sans religion. On ne parloit parmi eux, ni de maison, ni de ville; et comme ils n’avoient aucune sorte d’esprit, ils ne savoient ni cultiver la terre, ni filer la laine ou le coton pour en faire des habits propres pour couvrir leur nudité... Les herbes des champs, les racines des arbres, les fruits sauvages, et même la chair humaine, étoient les alimens dont il se nourrissoient comme les bêtes... Ils mennoient un vie tout-à-fait brutale

themselves clothes; as feeding on the roots of trees, and on wild herbs and fruits, and even on human flesh, as men without civilization or religion—beings scarcely raised above the brute creation? Why, that in general the sense of shame is not, as is here implied, connected with the sense of nakedness, where the use of clothing is unknown, but with the sense of nakedness, where the use of clothing is habitual.⁷

In the preceding chapter, the Deity was called Elohim; in this, he is Jehovah Elohim.

If now we compare the cosmogonies of these two chapters,—the cosmogony of Elohim with that of Jehovah Elohim,—we shall find that, *in the one*, being is given to a universe,—the world and its heaven; while, *in the other*, that a garden⁸ only is planted, over which is hung a canopy of clouds;⁹ that *this* begins with the formation of man, for whose wants or pleasures all trees, with a single exception, and fowl and beasts are one after the other called into existence; while *that*, commencing with the creation of animals of rudest, gradually proceeds on to others of nicer and more complicated organization, till it concludes with man, who is immediately invested with a sovereignty over all¹ animated nature. The first cosmogony shows us

et s'occupoient avec les premières femmes qu'ils rencontroient, sans en avoir aucune en propre, ou qui leur fut particulière."—Histoire des Yncas, lib. c. xv.

⁷ Yet the men of Nootka-Sound (the women were more modest) are described by Capt. Cook as throwing off, on all occasions, the whole of their covering, and appearing quite naked; and this without the slightest shame.—Captain Cook's Third Voyage, c. iv.

⁸ Gesenius, speaking of the geographical knowledge of the Hebrew, observes that: to him "Die Erde als eine vom Horizont beschränkte Scheibe erschien, deren Gränzen er sich nicht allzuweit hinter den ihm bekannten fernsten

Völkern, im Westen den Küstenländern des Mittelmeers, im Norden dem Gog und Magog, im Süden den Ägyptern und Kuschäern, im Osten den Persern und Medern dachte."—Comment. üb. d. Jesaja, v. 26.

¹ I would liken the creation in this chapter to the Persian, which creates a mountain Albordj, or a river Ardouissour, &c., which it afterwards makes the father and grandfather of all other mountains or rivers.

² "Behold! I have given you every herb, and every tree," &c.—Gen. i. 29. "Of every tree that is in the garden thou mayest eat, but of the tree of knowledge," &c.—Gen. ii. 16.

man as the lord of creation ; the second as the servant of God. The *one* is nervous and hurried in its style, abhorrent of detail, and full of large views : its thoughts, methodically and artistically arranged, point to and cluster round its Author's purpose ; it is a noble hymn to man's greatness, and to God the Creator's glory. The second, on the other hand, is a narrative, and told with all the graceful, and sometimes garrulous, and sometimes fragmentary, simplicity of the olden world ; it seems to hurry away from any comprehensive view ; it loves the real and the individual ; it delights in all details and particulars, which are made to follow each other according to the laws of the most vulgar, but most natural, association : at every line, some knowledge geographical or philological, or some reason to be rendered, seems to lure the author from his purpose ; much of what he tells, he tells by the way ; and though he knows of facts only, they are facts that labour with meaning, and facts that explain or solve all those great problems which rouse to inquiry even the slumbering mind of infant Humanity ; they form the first facts of history, and they are the vindication of God's ways to man.

CHAPTER III.

GENESIS iii. 6.

Verses 1-7. How strangely is the serpent every where mixed up with the development of the religious sentiment in man. *Sometimes* it is a God—worshipped with all due fear and trembling, as throughout Africa¹ and among the lower castes of India,² and the more savage tribes of America.³ At *others*, it is a symbol merely, and the symbol,

i. Of the evil principle,—as in Persia, where it stands as the representative of Ahriman,⁴ who, in its form, first visited the earth, and produced all venomous animals, and burnt this world, and laid it desolate.

ii. Of superior wisdom and power,—as in China, where the Tien-hoangs, the kings of heaven, and the Ti-lings, the sovereigns of earth, are said to have the bodies of serpents.⁵

And iii. It is a symbol, sometimes of good, and sometimes of evil.

¹ “ Sur les côtes de l’Afrique, on n’a guère trouvé des nations qui ne révéraient les serpens.”—De Pauw, *Egyptiens et Chinois*, vol. ii, p. 116.

² Dubois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. ii, p. 436.

³ As the Antis, the Chachapuyas, the Huacrachucas, &c. Garcilasso de la Vega; *Hist. des Yncas*, vol. i, p. 204, 416.

⁴ Boun-Dehesch, § iii. p. 352, *Zend*.

⁵ “ Nous expliquons ordinaire-

ment Long par dragon, animal qui inspire en Europe une idée de gros serpent, et qui se prend presque toujours en mauvaise part ; au lieu que chez les Chinois, Long offre presque toujours une si belle idée que c’est un des plus beaux symboles.”—(De Guignes, *Chou-king*, *Prelim. Dis.* p. 66, 67.) “ Long les genies bienfaisants,” (id. p. 128.) The Ti-lings have, however, with the face of a girl, the feet and body of a horse.

As, 1st, in Egypt,⁶—where it is the mythic form of the great Kneph, the eternal spirit, and the author of all good; and also of Tithrambo, the God angry, and inflicting on man deserved punishment;⁷ and, lastly, of Typhon,⁸ evil, physical and moral, embodied.

2ndly. In Greece,—where, as good, it draws the peaceful car of the corn-giving Ceres, or winds itself round the staff of the wise and wakeful Mercury, or waits at the feet of the health-restoring Esculapius; and where, as evil, it is also found, hissing from the girdles of the terrible Eumenides, or united to the earth-born bodies of the blaspheming giants, or dying under the arrows of the young Apollo.

And 3rdly. In India,—where, welcomed as the harbinger of good fortune, it glides unharmed mid temples or cottages;⁹ and where, as the symbol of eternity, it sails on the great milk-sea, bearing the sleeping Vischnu:¹ but where, also, as the genius of evil, it vainly wrestles with the mountain goddess Pârvâti,² or is seen torn to pieces and devoured by the bird-god Garouda,³ or, with bruised head, writhing beneath the feet of the love-inspiring Chrishna.⁴

⁶ Not in Egypt merely, but in Phœnicia also, according to Sanchoniatho, *Την μεν ουν του Δρακοντος φυσιν και οφειων εξεθειαςεν ο Τααντος, και μετ' αυτον αυθις Φουνεκες τε και Αιγυπτιοι.*

⁷ Jablonski *Pant. Egypt*, lib. i, c. iv. § v.

⁸ *Creuzer Symbolik*, B. ii, c. i, § 8, from Jomard, *Des. of the Typhonium*. Kircher also asserts that "in the Egyptian symbolical alphabet it was an emblem of subtlety and cunning, and of lust and sensual pleasure." *Middleton's Letters to Dr. Waterland*, Works, vol. ii, p. 151.

⁹ "Ils nourrissent de ces serpens à la porte des temples, et jusques dans leurs propres maisons. Ils leurs donnent le nom de Nalla Pom-bou, qui signifie bon serpent; car

disent-ils il fait le bonheur des lieux qu'il habite." *Lettres Edif. et Cur.* vol. xi; *Mœurs des Indes*, p. 84; also *Wilson's Hindu Theatre*, v. i; *Toycart*, p. 21.

¹ *Dubois*, vol. ii, p. 437. I need not remind the reader of the great serpent in the cosmogony of Orpheus.

² Sakti als Berggöttin heisst sie Pârvâti, oder Durga, und als solche wird sie am gewöhnlichsten vorgestellt, wie sie mit einer von Schlangen umringten Figur kämpft welche zugleich das feindliche Princip der Natur, die Ursache ihrer Verschlechterung anzeigt."—*Vide Von Bohlen, Das Alte Indien*, vol. i, p. 249.

³ *Dubois*, vol. ii. p. 438 (note).

⁴ *Asiatic Researches*, vol. iii, p. 261.

So much for the serpent, as it appears in other creeds, and in other lands. Not such, however, is the serpent of Moses.⁵ With him, it is neither a God, nor a symbol⁶ of any principle, good or evil, but a *bona fide* beast of the field, remarkable as the principal agent in a supposed historical fact, which is meant to explain and account for the *misery* and *misfortunes* of mankind.⁷

But why, it may be asked, was the serpent chosen to play this part? *With some commentators*, and, in truth, it is pleasant to measure great men by one's own littleness, we may answer,—in hate to the Egyptians; because, among them, the serpent was the symbol of the Godhead. Or, *with others*, no jot more magnanimous,—out of regard to the acquired prejudices of the Hebrew people; because, during their sojourn in Egypt, they had learned to look on the serpent as the symbol of the evil-working Typhon. But, if we are satisfied with the reason alleged in the myth, we will merely answer,—“because the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field.” Yes; his mysterious goings in and comings out, his quick and watchful eye,⁸

⁵ In Moses, however, the serpent is not altogether evil: raised in the wilderness, it there gives health and life to the dying Hebrew.

⁶ I read the words according to their simplest and most obvious meaning, viz., that the serpent, “one of the beasts of the field which the Lord God had made,” was more subtle than the rest: but in ours, and the several translations I have consulted, the “which the Lord God had made,” may refer to the beasts of the field as opposed to the serpent, who may there be the evil principle, or the creation of the evil principle. Such a reading, however, seems to me at variance with the nineteenth verse of the second chapter; though, as it crossed my mind, and is an objection to my view of the subject, I have thought it right to mention it.

⁷ I use the words advisedly, for

it does not account for the origin of evil. For the serpent—observe the bitter irony of his words, he speaks as if God mocked his creatures (vide Luther's Com. on B. i, Moses)—thought evil; from evil motives induced the man to eat. When man was expelled from Eden, “the imaginations of his heart were evil from his youth;” but how came the evil in the serpent's heart? When we have our first *question* answered, how many centuries pass away ere we examine and question on the answer!

⁸ Lenz “Schlangenkunde” says that day and night he has come upon serpents unawares, that he has watched them diligently, carefully, but never found them asleep, *i. e.* insensible to outward objects. A sort of torpor seems to supply the place of sleep. Among the names of the serpent in India are the fol-

his tortuous, stealthy, and silent motion, have, like the owl's face, gained for their owner a great reputation. The mythological serpent is the very ideal of subtlety, cunning, and sagacity; and the reflex of his fame has fallen upon his brother of natural history, who, however, on a closer knowledge of his habits and character, is found to be a very common-place beast indeed, and, save that he poisons where he bites, without any pre-eminence over his fellow-beasts.

But why, instead of the evil one, the evil principle embodied, choose a beast⁹ to tempt man to his death? With the people whom Moses addressed, the serpent was no improbable agent. Why, then, should he destroy the simplicity, the unity of his creed, by opposing to his one God, an angry and destroying demon? Besides, such a demon Moses had seen acknowledged in Egypt;—and there he was, not merely abominable, but powerful,—not merely hated, but feared. With heaven's King, though to be eventually conquered, he held, for the present, divided empire, and had claim, therefore, to divided homage,—and to his honour, as to that of God, temples were raised;¹ his worship was sanctioned by unholy rites, and his wrath propitiated by unclean sacrifices.² Had not, then, Moses to fear; and was he not, therefore, justified in avoiding every thing which might induce a similar idolatry? Or, is it that the author of this legend, wiser than they that came after him, recognized no evil one; that his

lowing:—"He who has eyes for ears," "the secret one," "he of tricks."—Roberts' Illustrations of Scripture, p. 7.

⁹ I think it right to observe, that, in Arabic, if I may judge from a note of Sale's in the Koran, the same word may intend either a serpent or a devil. The passage in the Koran is this:—"The tree Al Zak-kuen issueth from the bottom of hell, the fruit thereof resembleth the *heads of devils*." Sale, in a note, adds, "or of serpents ugly to behold: the original word signifies

both." (Vide Koran, vol. ii, c. xxxvii, p. 299.) With the serpent of the old Persian faith, and this serpent in Genesis, it is not, however, difficult to account for this double meaning to the same word in Arabic.

¹ Creuzer, Symbolik, B. ii, c. i, §8.

² Vid. Plutarch, Iris and Osiris, p. 607. To Typhon the detested red ox was sacrificed, though a single white or black hair saved him, as nothing that was dear to the Gods could be offered to the evil one.

mind was so occupied with the unity of God, that there was not room in it for any antagonist principle;³ and that, the evils therefore, which he could not but admit, he was compelled to impute to man's own fault?

But how did the serpent speak? Did "he utter a serpent's mind with serpent's hiss?"⁴ or did he speak verily, in good set terms? If we can suppose that the serpent was so like a seraph that Eve mistook him for a good angel, or that he even had the face of a seraph, we can also easily suppose, that he spoke very passable Hebrew.⁵ But, I must own, I do not see why a seraph, or a half-seraph, or a half-seraph-half-snake, should be any more a serpent in the time of Moses, than in our own.

Some commentators, however, of the new school of rationalists, will have it that the serpent spake never a word. The whole tale is an historical myth. In some paradise of Asia,⁶ God created, and placed, though separated from each other, the first pair. Adam, with the beasts of the field as his companions, observed their habits, and imitated their cries, and thus gave them names, and, besides, learned to distinguish animal from animal, and species from species. But Adam soon felt his loneliness, and proceeded in search of some companion for himself. One day, wearied with wandering, he laid himself down to sleep, and dreamt that of his rib had been formed a being like himself, a help-meet for him:—he awoke, and before him stood woman.

³ For Deut. xxxii, 17. We find in our translation a mention of devils. "They sacrificed unto devils." The marginal reading, and I find it corroborated by De Wette's translation, has, "They sacrificed unto things which were not God." But the personification of the evil principle in devils is surely a conception, very different from that of an idol, that which is not God. The first mention we have of Satan is in 1 Chronicles xxi. 1; but this book, it is generally allowed, was compiled

after the captivity. But compare with it 2 Samuel xxvi. 1; and see Warburton's *Divine Legation*, vi. § 2.

⁴ *Arcadia*, p. 222.

⁵ The opinions of the divines of the preceding century.—Patrick, Tenison, &c.: by many of them, also, Hebrew was supposed to have been the language of Eden.

⁶ Eichhorn, Gabler, &c., from Eichhorn's *Bib. der Bib. Lit.*, but quoted from memory.

Now in the garden which our common ancestors inhabited were to be found a tree of life, i. e. "dropping medicinal gum," and a tree of knowledge, i. e. some poisonous plant, against which the Elohim had warned Adam. Of the fruit of this last tree, however, Eve saw the serpent frequently eat, and escape unharmed.—Her own thoughts now tempt her.⁷ She begins to doubt the motives and warnings of God, and to suspect that the serpent, the subtlest of animals, owes to this fruit his superior wisdom. She eats of it, and urges her husband to eat also.—New and tumultuous emotions are thus awaked in them.—Towards evening a storm arises: to the unaccustomed sight of our first parents, it is a punishment from God. They hide themselves in the thicket; but the thunder reaches them even there,—and its repeated peals drive them at length from Eden, which their superstitious fears prevent them ever again entering.⁸

The rationalists have thus, it seems to me, removed indeed one difficulty, and have set up in its place another, and a greater. For, though they have deprived our legend of that savour which makes it unpalatable to the few, yet, as it is but one of a thousand, to all of which, as of similar nature, the same method of interpretation must necessarily be applied; it follows, that to unravel them all into a series of possible occurrences, we are compelled to assume

⁷ Similarly in Göthe's *Faust*. The suggestions of Margaret's despair are represented in the temptations of whispering demons. (See the scene p. 267, translation by John Hills.)

⁸ J. G. Rosenmüller supposes the whole tale relating to the fall of man to be a description of some hieroglyphical painting. The serpent then stands for Satan; and much that in the legend seems trivial is but the painter's rude attempt to describe the mind's emotions, as—"they sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves aprons," and, "the Lord God made coats of skins," &c.—he supposes to

be but pictorial expressions, which mean that man sought to hide his shame, to pacify his conscience, but vainly; he but covered himself as if with fig-leaves. God, however, gave him coats of skins, i. e. really hid his shame, gave him peace of conscience. I will not go further into Rosenmüller's hypothesis, (who would see it at full length will find it in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, vol. i, p. 158, 185), but observe merely, that it is based on the supposition that pictorial, or hieroglyphical, was the first, writing, which is probable enough: but it is certain that pictorial speech was before either.

such a multitude of extraordinary combinations of common events, as to render a history, formed of such combinations, a far greater miracle, than a history of simple miracles. Myself, I could more readily believe in the miracle.

But how did the serpent speak? The language of bird and beast is a belief, which originated, and is still fondly cherished,⁹ in the east. Many of the negro tribes, too, are fully persuaded that the monkey could talk if he would, but that he fears to be compelled to the drudgery of a hewer of wood, and a drawer of water. Might not, then, some such fable relating to the serpent have prevailed among the half-civilized Hebrews? And, in *their* eyes, would not this legend, consequently, unobstructed by improbabilities, have very satisfactorily accounted for the origin of evil? But, in *ours*, what is it? A fragment from the philosophy of the earliest ages, which neither demands our belief, nor is necessary to our faith, but which is full of instruction for us, by the deep insight it gives into the simple creed of infant man. With such instruction, however, our orthodox divines will not rest satisfied. We must believe these tales of wonder as historical facts; we must not see that they are altogether at variance with our notions of God, and of God's providence; and that they dwarf down the Great Supreme to a *Deus ex machinâ*,—some stage idol—who at every moment must interfere bodily to rectify the mischiefs which his general laws inflict upon mankind.

Verse 6. If man, in paradise, had fears, he had desires also, and desires which are still the fountain of much that

⁹ See the conversation between the crow Bhu'shanda' and the sage eagle Gerhur, in the last book of the Ra'ma'yan (Sir W. Jones' Works, vol. xiii, p. 343, 361); see also the Hitopadesa, vulgarly Pilpai's Fables, id. id. p. 12; and many of the tales in the Arabian Nights. The Koran, also, c. xxvii, makes Solomon to say: "O men! we have been taught the speech of

birds:" and see the beginning of this chapter, which has all the air of an Arabian tale. The same belief is found in the Northern Mythology: *e. g.*, it is the talk of the quails after the slaughter of the great serpent Fafnir, which decides the conduct and the fate of Sigurd. Vide Volsunga-Saga oder Sigurd der Fafnirstodter, v. d. Hagen, c. xxviii, p. 90.

is good and great in him; desires, not after the beauty of the fruit, the gratification of the palate merely, but desires to be wise. He sinned in paradise, as he often sins now, from mingled motives.

Verse 7. No great thing to learn, and to have lost Eden to learn it.¹ And yet view this legend in another light:—and how could the first step from a state of nature towards an artificial state, or state of civilization, be better intimated to an infant people? Man, in Eden, is the mere brute, the mere natural, man; and man, ignorant, rooted to earth, with no other wants than those of the body, and wants for which some luxuriant wilderness amply provides; man, mere animal, if man could even thus have existed, must be happy.² But the instant that artificial wants and feelings occupy him, and he must labour and struggle to satisfy them; the instant the intellect awakes, and a higher, or supposed higher, state of existence becomes possible;

¹ Parallel to this, is the case of the mother of the great family of man, who, according to the Iroquois legend, lost Heaven for a pot of bear's grease; see note ⁹, p. 64.

² The hill Demaras say of themselves: "We are a stupid race; we don't know or do any thing but look for food, and dance when we have got it; all we want to know is where to get a large animal to kill and eat."—Alexander's *Interior of Africa*. "The inhabitants of Port-Philip (New South Wales) are cannibals, eating the bodies of their enemies killed in battle. Their perceptions of hearing, seeing, and smelling, are remarkably acute. Their food consists chiefly of kangaroo's flesh, fish, roots of every kind, black swans, ducks, &c., as well as reptiles. In their appetites they are quite voracious. They appear to be *without any religious observances*, although they evidently believe in a future state.....They are of a cheerful happy disposition, and in the evenings sing and dance for amusement."—Hobart-Town

Almanack for 1837. And the Caribbees, we are told: "Erreichen wegen ihrer gesunden Natur meistentheils ein hohes Alter. Sie leben ohne Sorge und Bekümmerniss, wissen nichts von Gemüths unruhe, und führen eine sehr mässige Lebensart. Sie geniessen eine reine Luft und Leben unter einer günstigen Himmelsgegend."—Sit. der Wilden, vol. ii, p. 21. Similarly happy, and altogether incurious, Wallis describes the Americans at Elizabeth Bay (*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. xxx, p. 23); similarly Parry and Lyon, the Esquimaux, adding, that even in the midst of the most fearful hunger they are cheerful and gay; and so Robertson speaks of the aborigines of Mexico and Peru. It would seem that not so much the pressure of outward circumstances makes man's misery, as the comparison of any present with some better state. The state of the savage is a dead sleep; ours is a troubled and feverish dream.

that instant man feels his nakedness, his littleness, and is ashamed.—He has eaten of the tree of knowledge.

“And they sewed fig-leaves together, and made to themselves aprons.” Not sewed,³ but interwove, and bound together; and not the leaves of the common, but of the Indian fig, still used for that same purpose by the more barbaric races of Asia. Such aprons, according to the Chinese books,⁴ are said to have been, and were, not improbably, man’s first covering; and they were, according to Garcilasso de la Vega, worn by several of the American tribes.⁵

Our parents ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, and afterwards felt, for the first time, naked and ashamed. The author of our legend, who probably inhabited the warmer latitudes of Asia, where clothing of some sort is in general use; and who knew of no nation, no people, who went altogether naked (though perhaps of many whose scanty covering was limited to that which decency required), could attribute the custom of concealing from sight certain parts of the body to no other motive than that of shame. And this shame of nakedness, because he conceived it universal, he seeks to account for, by holding it up to us as the first symptom of that *enduring* change which the fruit of the tree of knowledge brought upon the human race. From various sources, however, we know that among several of the races of Africa,⁶ and the more

³ “La plus grande partie du genre humain a été longtemps sans connoître le fil.”—Goguet, Origine des Lois, vol. i, c. ii.

⁴ “Au commencement les hommes se couvroient avec des herbes :—

‘Circum se foliis ac frondibus involventes.’”

—De Guignes, Chon-king, Dis. Prelim. p. 78.

⁵ “Dans les pays où ils ne savoient ce que c’étoit ni de tissure ni de fillet, les uns et les autres couvroient les parties honteuses avec les feuilles ou l’écorce de quelque arbre.”—Histoire des Yncas, lib. i,

c. xiii. And the missionary Padilla, whose honest and pious zeal, however one may differ from him, all must admire, finding the savages among whom he was sent, naked, taught them to cover their nakedness with the leaves of trees: “Cependant on se sert comme on peut de feuilles d’arbres pour se couvrir, en attendant quelque chose de mieux.”—Lettres Edifiantes, viii, p. 48.

⁶ The inhabitants of the Coast of Guinea: “Les femmes des Vétires sont tout-à-fait nues.”—Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. iii, p.

rude tribes of America, "Nature has not suggested any idea of impropriety in being altogether uncovered."⁷ We know that shame, therefore, is not invariably connected with the sense of nakedness. One of three things, then,—either the view of our author, however satisfactory for his age and country, is too narrow and circumscribed for ours; or the results of the terrible fruit were not of universal consequence, have not been inherited by all mankind; or, the human race is not descended from one common stock. And these conclusions, either taken together or separately, are, it is certain, more or less at variance with the notions of inspiration usually attached to this legend.

Verse 20. How natural and dramatic is this picture! In the cool of the day, when the evening breeze arises, Jehovah Elohim, like some oriental satrap, walks forth in his garden to take his pleasure. His creatures, to whom his presence was formerly a joy, and in whose innocent simplicity he himself took delight,⁸ nowhere meet his eyes. He calls to Adam—but the man has eaten of the tree of knowledge; he feels, and shudders at, the immeasurable distance which separates him from his Maker, and he comes forth reluctantly. He knows not how to approach the Lord. He feels naked and is ashamed: his guilt is thus betrayed, and he stands convicted of having tasted of the forbidden fruit. But the woman, so he excuses himself, who had been given to him as his help-meet, had been his tempter.⁹ To her Jehovah turns; and she, it seems, had eaten because the serpent beguiled her. Man, woman, and serpent, then stand before their judge; and on each he pronounces sentence. The form of the serpent is changed; from henceforth he crawls

425; id. Par.; and see note vol. iii, p. 56. The Ichthyophagi (Diod. Sic. vol. vii, lib. iii).

⁷ Robertson's America, p. 358; and Lafitau, Mœurs des Sauvages, vol. ii, p. 55; and Lettres Edifiantes, Amérique, vol. viii, p. 40. "The men (of California) were actually naked, *except that they*

wore some ornaments for the head, of feathers, shells, or seeds."—Forbes' California, p. 18.

⁸ Vide c. ii, v. 19, &c.

⁹ This is altogether in eastern taste. "It is the nature of women," says Menu, "in this world to cause the seduction of man."—ii, § 213.

upon his belly,¹ and eats of the dust of the earth. Between him and man are enmity and continued, though unequal,² war, and a war which shall end only in the annihilation of his race. The woman is made subject to her husband, and punished with the pains of childbirth; while the man is condemned to a life of toil and disappointment.

"And dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life."³ Hyde asserts, that as neither devil nor serpent⁴ eats dust, these words must be used metaphorically, and are but intended to express the abasement, the abject condition⁵ to which the serpent is to be henceforth reduced. In this case, the literal⁶ and the metaphorical are strangely mixed up together. I should rather understand the words in their simple and most obvious sense, and explain them by supposing that they allude to opinions⁷ respecting the food of serpents, once held, but long since exploded.

¹ Was the fabulous dragon already known to the patriarchal world? Or did the fossil remains of strange antediluvian animals give rise to the belief that the serpent once walked or flew, as (though I am aware another meaning is given to the passage, vide Michaelis, *De Wette's translations*) in Isaiah, xiv. 29. The Zend book speaks of "l'ancien serpent infernal, qui a deux pieds, cet Ashmogh impur." Farg. vol. i, 205.

² "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

³ "Necessario fuit vera species serpentis, quia pœna inflicta fuit tanquam in speciem serpentis, *super ventri tuo gradiaris*, sive figuratè, sive literaliter; sed non item literaliter, *et pulverem comedes*; quia diabolus qui serpentem obsedit non edit omnino, et serpens non edit pulverem, qui non est alimentum cujusvis animalis."—Hyde *Hist. Rel. Vet. Pers.*, c. iii.

⁴ According to Roberts, the Vireyan serpent eats dust.—Illustrations of Scripture, p. 7.

⁵ As in Persia the common phrase, "I shall make him to eat dirt."

⁶ "Upon thy belly shalt thou crawl." To eat dust has the same meaning, according to later commentators. They appeal, as parallel passages, to Isaiah xlix. 23; Micah vii. 17; Psal. lxxii. 9; and also, "to eat ashes," for "to sit in ashes," Psal. cii. 10; Eichhorn's *Urgeschichte in Repertor*, vol. iv. p. 247.

⁷ Thus Micah, 710 B.C.:—"They shall lick dust like a serpent," viii. 17. This very passage, Hyde (ut supra), has adduced in confirmation of his opinion, that this part of the curse on the serpent is metaphorical merely; for he says, though serpents do not eat dust, "*videntur tamen sic facere, et eundem lambere, quia inter gradiendum orae eorum terram contingunt.*" Gesenius, however (*Comment. Jesaiah*, c. lxv. v. 25; vol. iii. p. 292, shows that it was a popular error among the ancients, that serpents did eat dust. Hyde explains the origin of that error, but he was precluded by the view which he took of the book of Genesis, from making use of a popular notion to interpret words put into the mouth of the Deity.

Luther and Hyde are both of opinion that the serpent of this legend is a natural serpent; *the one*,⁸ because he fears to gloze over God's word, and to accommodate it to human views; *the other*,⁹ because he cannot reconcile it to God's justice that the serpent-race should be punished for the crimes of some other creature. Notwithstanding, however, the zeal of *the one* for God's word, and of *the other* for God's justice, both agree¹ in regarding the serpent but as a mask behind which Satan acts, or as an instrument which he moves. *Of the former*, we would therefore ask, *where* and *how* the story alludes to the evil one, or the principle of evil? And *of the latter*, whether it is in accordance with the simplest and most evident views of justice, that on the serpent, literally reduced to one of Descartes' beasts, should be laid so heavy a curse, while the true criminal escapes without even a reprimand? No; I believe the tempter to be a natural serpent; 1st, on the authority of the legend; and, 2nd, because I find him punished with a serpent's nature.

Verse 15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed," &c. In this passage I see an announcement of that mutual hate which exists between the serpent-race and mankind—each individualized in the words "thy seed," and "her seed;"—but no allusion to the Messiah, and the victory which he is to gain over sin and death.

I can, however, well conceive, that, literally understood, this legend, with its child-like philosophy, became, in the

⁸ "Es gebürt uns nicht Gottes Wort zu deuten, wie wir wollen. Wir sollen es nicht lenken, sondern uns nach ihm lassen lenken, und ihm die Ehre geben, das es besser gesetzt sey denn wirs können machen. Darumb müssen wirs lassen stehen das es eine rechte natürliche Schlange gewesen sey, die das Weib mit Augen gesehen hat, und ist darumb geschrieben, das die Historie gefasset würde in einen leicht-

ten Verstand. Denn sollt er so schreiben, das der Teuffel hette mit ihr geredet in eigener Person, würde sich nicht schicken. Darumb hat er müssen durch die Schlange reden."—Moses ausgelegt durch, D.M.L., B. i, c. iii, v. i.

⁹ Vide note to p. 95.

¹ Vide note, supra, from Luther. Hyde calls the serpent "instrumentum et vehiculum tentationis diabolicæ."—Ut supra.

course of ages, insufficient for the mental wants of an improved and more thoughtful state of society; and that there then necessarily grew up—for its divine authority was not doubted—different modes of interpreting it. *Some*, struck by man's weakness and liability to sin, would view the tale as an allegory,² in which the serpent was the symbol of that cunning sophistry which, when they would lure us on to pleasure or self-advantage, the senses and the understanding oppose to the laws and dictates of reason. While *others*, convinced that man could come forth from the hands of his all-wise and perfect Maker but as a wise and perfect being, received the legend as an historical fact, which accounted for man's present degenerated state. But man, wise and perfect, no mere serpent, but the evil principle alone, could tempt; and the serpent, therefore, was raised into the agent and representative of Satan. And as each of these parties followed out his own hypothesis, each one necessarily explained the curse on the serpent, and more particularly that part of the curse now under consideration, according to his own views. The *former* regarded it as a prediction of that great victory which, in the latter times, the reason shall gain over the flesh, the law of God over the law of sin—as an announcement of that perfect society which poets and philosophers have dreamt of, and which Christianity promises under the name of the Millennium; while the *latter*,³ knitting mercy with justice, hope with punishment, revered it as the first prophecy of the Messiah, whose death and resurrection gave the blow which will finally destroy the power and kingdom of Satan.

Verse 16. “Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow,”⁴ &c.

² See Ammon's *Christologie des Alt. Test.* 1 Per. p. 19, and Middleton's Letter to Dr. Waterland, Works, vol. ii, p. 149.

³ Rosenmüller thus translates the passage: “Inimicitias excitabo inter te et mulierem, inter *tuum genus* et *unum ex mulieris* pos-

teritate: hic te *proculcabit*, licet a te victo *mordebitur*.” See Ammon's *Christologie des Alt. Test.* p. 17, where may be found the objections to this reading; and, also, the various explanations of which the passage is susceptible.

⁴ I will not say there is contra-

As his punishment explains why the form of the serpent so much deviates from that of the rest of the brute creation, so now the sentence pronounced upon the woman accounts for those differences which unfavourably distinguish her from the man. She is subjected to the pains, more acutely felt in our northern climes, of child-bearing⁵ and child-birth; and from the equal of her husband, she is (according to a custom long established in oriental households, but rejected by the more civilized nations of Europe) degraded to his slave.⁶

Verses 17-19. For man's sake earth was created; for man's sake made beautiful and fertile; and is for man's crime now cursed. It is no more covered with trees pleasant to the sight and good for food: no, thorns and thistles are its natural productions; by the sweat of his brow alone "shall man eat of it," and then in sorrow. Truly Jehovah Elohim is the Jewish Deity, the object of Jewish worship, the reflex of the Jewish mind; *to-day blessings, to-morrow curses only*, issue from his lips—but with this difference: that his blessings he doles out to individuals like an alms, while his curses he pours forth over a world.

"In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life."
We of the north know the *ennui*, but not the luxuries of

diction, but is there not some disagreement between this verse and the 28th verse of the first chapter?

⁵ Of the African women voyagers tell us: "La facilité des femmes à se délivrer de leur fruit dans l'accouchement, paroîtroit incroyable si elle n'étoit attestée par tous les voyageurs. Elles ne jettent pas un cri; elles ne poussent pas même un soupir."—Hist. Gen. des Voyages, vol. iii, p. 171. But the Ostiack and the Samojede women, have the same facility in their confinements: "Elles accouchent sans paroître ressentir aucun douleur, elles se contentent de s'asseoir au premier endroit, fût-il même couvert de neige," &c.—Id. xviii. p. 517.

⁶ There is no contradiction between these and the observations attached to the 21st verse of the second chapter; or, if there be contradiction, it is not of my making. The forms of marriage, and of language, in the East, recognise the woman as the equal of her husband, as a wife; while, in fact, she is every where a slave. See the Duties of an Indian Wife, in Michelet, Origines de Droit Français, chap. ii. Mariage Indien. That the state of the wife among the Hebrews was little better, the polygamy of the patriarchs, and the wives and concubines of the kings, sufficiently prove.

indolence ; *they of the east*, on the other hand, feel all the exertion and fatigue of labour, but cannot appreciate the enduring cheerfulness which a life of industry ensures. *To us*, Eden with its idyllic and somewhat monotonous pleasures, had been intolerable ; *for them* it is Paradise indeed, the very ideal of an earthly heaven. *On them*, consequently, the curse of Jehovah Elohim presses heavily, while *on us* it lies a feather-weight. *They* eat their bread, earned indeed with comparative ease, in insecurity and sorrow ; and *we* ours, wrung though it be from an unwilling soil, in peace, and content, and joy.

But we must not forget that among the nations of antiquity, in the times of Moses, this curse was literally realized. Labour was then lightened by none of those hopes which render it pleasant to civilized man ; it was all bitter. As the slave's portion, it never took, never could wear, the cheerful form of industry ; it made, *not the man himself*, but *his owner*, rich. As the lot of the poorer citizens, it was, instead of a bond of union, the great gulph between them and their nobler neighbours. For, as the rich man possessed numerous slaves, he was seldom called upon to hire the labour of freemen ; and as he was himself a dealer in labour, a trader in artizans, he looked upon those freemen as his rivals : he hated them for their independence, and had no feeling for their misfortunes. By his wealth, and the extent of his operations, he gradually narrowed their means,⁷ and oppressed and ruined their trade, and drove them from the exercise of the city arts, and reduced them to till their little spot of ground for their daily bread. And then one bad season, one failure of their crops, or a murrain among

⁷ "Ce n'était pas aux riches," says M. de Cassagnac, "que les ouvriers réunis en jurandes pouvaient offrir leur travail. Était-ce aux pauvres ? Mais auprès de ceux-ci les jurandes trouvaient encore la concurrence des loueurs d'esclaves. Et quelle concurrence ? nous l'avons déjà dit, la concurrence de capitalistes, comme Cras-

sus, qui répétait souvent...qu'un homme ne peut pas se vanter d'être riche, à moins d'avoir de quoi solder une armée de quarante mille hommes avec ses revenus."—Hist. des Classes Ouvrières et Bourgeoises, chap. xii.; and see, also, Plutarch, M. Crassus ; & Sismondi, Histoire des Français, vol. i, p. 51 & 447, ed. Belge.

their cattle (*all* accidents far more frequent in those days than in ours), compelled them to become suitors to their richer neighbour: and he purchased their heart's-blood by hard loans, dragged them down to the rank of dependants, and gradually forced them into slavery.⁸

Man is also made subject to death. This simple legend, as written for all countries, and for all times, I have judged as a European of the nineteenth century, A.D.; but let me now view it as written in, and for men of, the nineteenth century of a previous era—as the preface to Moses' code of laws; and in how different a light it then appears! It speaks to us of a Deity who realizes the loftiest conceptions of infant man,—of the Creator who is powerful and beneficent, and whose creation man's crime alone has soiled. It offers us a probable solution of all those high mysteries which agitate man's inexperienced mind; it tells us how sin came into the world, and misery, and death. It teaches us, moreover, by awful examples, not to examine into, but to fulfil, God's commands; it warns us,—never mind how pure and noble our motives—against disobedience; it holds up disobedience to us as a sin of the deepest die, and one, the punishment of which affects, not merely the criminal, but all inanimate nature. And now, in our simple faiths, are we not prepared to receive the code of Moses as the code of God? To yield to it a blind veneration? Will we not, shrinking away from all scrutiny, inquire merely, what it is the law commands, and not whether its command is wise and just? Will we not, terrified by the power and the punishments of an all-searching Deity, readily learn to check all lawless passions, and to subdue ourselves to the

⁸ As instances, I might adduce the manner in which the whole Egyptian people were reduced to slavery by Joseph; also the laws regarding slavery in the code of Moses (see Deut. xv. 12); also the well-known usury-laws of Rome, which had their parallel in ancient Greece (vide Wachsmuth, *Hist. Antiq. of Greece*, vol. ii, lib. ii, c. v, § vi, p. 365); and finally, I may

appeal to the direct testimony of Chinese writers, who, amid other causes of slavery in China, enumerate: “les troubles et malheurs de la troisième dynastie; alors les pauvres qui se voyoient sans ressource, se donnoient, avec leurs familles, aux grands et aux riches qui vouloient les nourrir.”—*Mémoires des Chinois*, vol. ii, p. 410.

observance of numberless ceremonies? Self-restraint will then become a habit, conscience soon a heeded monitor, and we are already humanized; we have advanced beyond the state of impulses, the state of nature; and, unless arrested by a superstitious regard for laws once so beneficial, but each day growing more unnecessary, we are in the fair track to become a moral, and therefore a truly great, people.

And now we will recapitulate our legend; we will thus more readily perceive the several points in which it resembles, or differs from, the similar, or seemingly similar, legends of other people. According to Genesis, then, disobedience was the crime: a desire of knowledge, and unnecessary and ill-regulated appetites the motive: the serpent and the woman the tempters: and something edible the occasion: which lost man paradise, and made misery and sorrow the heir-looms of our race.

And 1. The Iroquois believe that the first men, living alone, were,

“ By the viewless winds,
Blown with resistless violence round about
The pendant world.”

Fearing the extinction of their race, and having learnt that a woman dwelt somewhere in the heavens, they deputed one of their number (Hogouaho the wolf) to seek her out. This messenger of mankind is borne to the skies on the wings of assembled birds; and, arrived there, he watches at the foot of a tree till the woman comes forth to draw water from a neighbouring well. On her approach he addresses her, gives her bear's fat, and thus seduces her. The Deity perceives her shame, and in his anger thrusts her out from heaven. The tortoise receives her on his back; and, from the depths of the sea the fish bring clay, and gradually build up an island on which the universal mother brings forth her first twins.⁷

This legend accords with ours of Genesis, merely in that it represents *man* as living in kindly fellowship with the

⁷ See Lafitau, *Mœurs des Sauvages*, vol. i, p. 93.

brute creation, and *woman* as banished from a joyful home, an Eden, because she gave way to her appetites. The points of difference are, however, many and material.

1st. The woman inhabits no luxuriant Eden, but heaven itself.

2nd. She is the tempted, and not the tempter.

3rd. Though, like Eve, she is banished to this common earth, her banishment, however wretched it may have made *her*, made man happy; her loss was man's gain. And,

4th. The original condition of mankind, unlike that of Adam, is here represented as wretched and uncertain. By the woman's punishment that condition is improved; through *her*, man is enabled to insure the continuance of his race, and through *her*, first gains a fixed habitation.

The one legend seems, in a narrative shape, to contain a solution of the principal religious difficulties of an infant and contemplative people. While *the other* probably is but the expression of the first dim reminiscences of some savage tribe, who, in the course of their wanderings, having seized or seduced away a woman of a more civilized and nobler race than themselves, through her influence, and at her persuasion, began a more settled course of life.

II. According to Hesiod,¹ the Greeks supposed that man originally lived wifeless and ignorant, but innocent and happy.² Prometheus (the great civilizer), however,

¹ I have, as quite sufficient for my purpose, preferred the simpler legend in "the Works and Days." The Theogony seems, however, to trace the origin of *all misery* to the crime of Saturn against his father Ouranos (v. 205-10), though it refers (v. 510), as in the Works, *the misery of man* more immediately to the folly of Epimetheus. In the

Theogony, as fulfilment of the prophetic curse of Uranus, we have—the fates of Menætiüs and Atlas detailed to us—as also the irreverent crime of Prometheus, and his theft of fire from Heaven, which thus connects our fortunes with those of the Titanic race. The Theogony has no golden age, no Pandora's box.

² "Πρὶν μὲν γὰρ ζῶεσκον ἐπὶ χθονὶ φύλ' ἀνθρώπων
νοσφιν ἀτερθε κακῶν, καὶ ἀτερ χαλεποιο πονοιο
νοσῶν τ' ἀργαλεῶν, αἱ τ' ἀνδρασι κηρας ἐδωκαν."—90, &c.

"The race of men lived upon the earth, without ills, and without painful labour, and cruel disease, which bring cure to man."

steals fire from Heaven, and teaches man its use. The angered Jupiter threatens vengeance. He orders Vulcan to form a woman of clay,³ on whom the gods bestow every grace and beauty, at the same time that they fill her heart with vanity, and cunning, and all violent desires. This woman, Pandora, Jupiter presents to Epimetheus, who, regardless of the warnings of his wiser brother, accepts the gift, and marries her. From that moment disease and evil of all sorts have been man's lot.⁴

In *this*, as in the *Hebrew* legend, the ill-regulated appetites of an individual cause the misery of the world. In *both*, man lives alone, and happy, and ignorant. In both the woman is created for the man: but *in the one*, of man's own flesh and as a helpmeet: *in the other*, of clay and as a curse. In the *former*, knowledge, that acquired by the magic tree: in the *latter*, the power knowledge confers, represented by fire,⁵ provokes the jealousy of the Deity. In *this*, however, the Deity appears as cunning and treacherous, as luring man on, though guilty of no ill, to his destruction; *in that*, though seeming to fear man's possible equality, the God is just, and pronounces on man but a promised, though, in consideration of the temptation, a somewhat commuted, sentence. *The one legend* never altogether forgets that its Deity is the wise and powerful

³ Γαίαν ἰδεῖ φυρεῖν, ἐν δ' ἀνθρώπου like the breath in Genesis. The
 θεμὲν ἀνδρῶν—"to knead earth with Theogony forms the woman of
 water, and place there the voice of earth alone: the earth and water
 a man (Ἔργ. καὶ ἡμέρ.)"—not un- typify her unstable sense.

⁴ "μυρία λυγρὰ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἀλαλγῆται:
 πλεῖη μὲν γὰρ γαῖα κακῶν, πλεῖη δὲ θάλασσα:
 νοῦσοι δ' ἀνθρωποῖσιν ἐφ' ἡμέρῃ ἣ δ' ἐπὶ νυκτὶ
 αὐτοματοὶ φοιτῶσι. κακὰ θνητοῖσι φέρουσαι
 σιγῇ, ἐπεὶ φωνὴν ἐξείλετο μητιετα Ζεὺς."—100, &c.

"Thousand griefs stray among men; full is the earth of ills, and full the sea; day and night, Plagues unbidden haunt our race, noiselessly bearing woes to men; for, of speech, the wise Jove has deprived them."

⁵ In Homer, Vulcan, the god of fire, is essentially the artist. In Hesiod, Theog. 929, he is:—

"Ἐκ πάντων τεχνῆσι κεκασμένον Οὐρανίωνων."

And in Æschylus, Prometheus, who gave fire to men, speaks of himself as one:—

"ἀφ' οὗ γε πολλὰς ἐκμαθήσονται τεχνᾶς."

Creator, while *the other* never rises beyond its first conception of the gods, who, like its men, are mere accidents.

III. According to the traditions of the Lamaic faith, the first men lived to the age of 60,000 years.⁶ They are represented as holy men, invisibly nourished, and as having possessed the wonderful power of raising themselves to the skies. In this age of the world the transmigration of souls was universal,—all men were twice born;⁷ and in this age it was that the thousand Burchan, or gods, settled themselves in the heaven. In an unlucky hour, the earth produced a honey-sweet substance,—a glutton ate of it, and seduced the rest of mankind to follow his example. From that time man lost his pristine holiness and innocence; he could no longer fly to heaven, and no longer attained the great age and giant size of the men of former times. He lived, too, a while in darkness, until at length a sun and the stars appeared. After a certain period, however, the *manna* began to fail: and man must feed now on earth-butter, and, shortly after, on a species of reed-grass, of which, taught by experience, they began to make provision: but this, too, became scarce:—and now all virtue fled the world, and adultery, murder, and injustice prevailed. Then men began to cultivate the earth, and to divide it among themselves; and they chose out from among themselves the most experienced to be their law-giver,—and he became their Chan.

Here, again, we have men innocent and happy, till their sensuality and ill-regulated appetites drive them down from misery to misery; and here, too, we have the first steps towards a civilized state associated with the lowest moral degradation. This legend is, however, true to itself;—it produced the universe and its inhabitants without a Creator, and it now, unlike the others, makes man's misery as it made his happiness, something altogether independent of the Deity.⁸

⁶ Pallas Reise, vol. i, p. 334.

the Brahmins are alone honoured as
“twice-born.”

⁷ In our days the privilege of the
higher priesthood only. In India

⁸ Yet, perhaps, is there no creed

iv. According to the Chalias of Ceylon, "The Brahmes are first represented as inhabiting the regions of the air, where they enjoyed perfect happiness. They fed on the earth, till, fearing that it would be entirely consumed, they divided it equally amongst themselves;" but the unfortunate idea of dividing destroyed the delicious flavour of the earth."... Chance then produced a species of mushroom, of which, as they also divided it, they were also deprived. Thus they proceeded from food to food, till at length these different kinds of food changed the nature of the Brahmes,—and, from spirit, they became matter in a human shape, having bones, flesh and blood:—"And, having imbibed wicked ideas, they became hermaphrodites, and communicated carnally with each other: the consequence was, that they lost their ancient glory."¹

This legend, with much that resembles, essentially differs from, the last. In both, indeed, the first men divide their time between earth and heaven; in both, they feed on the earth, and, as they degrade from food to food, lose some portion of their virtue, till at length they become common men. *In the one*, however, the inhabitants of the world are mortal men, holier indeed, and longer lived, than ourselves, but still mortal; *in the other*, they are immortal spirits. In *this* the desire to appropriate, selfishness, is the primary cause, in *that* the first consequence of man's misery; and that misery, in *the former*, is expressed by poverty, and the loss of moral excellence; in *the latter*, by the acquisition of a material body. *The one legend* accounts, then, for the wretchedness which is our lot; *while the other* but tells us how we became possessed of our bodily frames, of which all carnal appetites are the necessary result.

in which the priests claim higher honours, and have more uncontrolled power, than in the Lamaic. The fact is, they possess the power of distributing the good and ill of this world, and they keep also the keys of the heaven and hell of the next.

⁹ Vide also Buchanan on the Religion and Literature of the Burmese, Asiatic Researches, vol. vi, p. 246.

¹ Vide On the Religion and Manners of Ceylon, by Joinville, in Asiatic Researches, vol. vii, p. 438.

v. According to the Chinese, man is partly spirit, partly animal. The spirit follows the laws of heaven as a disciple his master; the animal, on the other hand, is the slave of sense. At his origin man obeyed the heavens: his first state was one of innocence and happiness,—there was no disease, no death,—he was wise and good by *instinct*: he was all spirit.² But the immoderate desire of knowledge, according to one author, or, according to others, gluttony, or the temptation of the woman, was the ruin of mankind.³ Man held no more power over himself: lust and passion gained ascendancy over him, and he lost his intellectual pre-eminence.⁴ All beasts, and birds, and reptiles, now waged war against him: as he acquired science, all creatures became his enemies.⁵

We find, then, among the Chinese, as among the Jews, an innocent, peaceful, and happy life attributed to the first men, and the same motives occasioning its loss. But the Chinese deal in generalities,—they evidently philosophize, conjecture only, and not always in harmony: they merely aim at the probable. The Jews, on the other hand, narrate a plain simple fact,—whether probable or not they care little,—they believe in it, and demand for it the belief in others.

vi. According to the Persian faith:—Ormuzd, when he

² Lo-pi, quoted by De Guignes, Chou-king, Dis. Prelim. p. 75, says, speaking of the golden age: “Que les hommes étoient spirituels et vertueux, qu’ils avoient tout du ciel et rien de l’homme. L’esprit, Chin, suit le ciel comme un disciple suit son maître; l’appétit, Kouei, la partie animale, sert en esclave aux choses sensibles. Au commencement, l’homme, obéissant au ciel, étoit tout esprit; mais ensuite, ne vieillissant pas sur lui-même, la passion prit le dessus, et il perdit l’intelligence.”

³ “Le désir immodéré de la science a perdu le genre humain, dit Hoainan-tsee. Selon le Tou-lai-see, la gourmandise a perdu l’uni-

vers, et a été la porte de tous les crimes. L’ancien proverbe dit, Il ne faut pas écouter les paroles de la femme. La glose: ‘Ces paroles indiquent que la perversion de la femme a été la première source et la racine de tous les maux.’”—Mémoires Chinoises, vol. i, p. 107.

⁴ Vide from Lo-pi, in De Guignes, ut supra.

⁵ This is also from Lo-pi: “Après la dégradation de l’homme, dit Lo-pi, les animaux, les insectes, et les serpents, commencèrent à l’envie à lui faire la guerre. Après que l’homme eut acquis la science, toutes les créatures furent ses ennemis.”—Mémoires Chinoises, vol. i, p. 107.

gave existence to the pure worlds of light, created also the Ferouers,⁶ or *εἰδωλα* of men. These Ferouers he placed in the pleasant Gorodman: and *there* they are supposed to wander, pure and happy, till, called forth to take part in the ever-during war against Ahriman and his Dews, they appear *as men* on the great battle-field of the world.⁷

"Man was," says the Boun-Dehesch,⁸ "the father of man was,—heaven was his destiny,—but he must be humble of heart, and humbly do the works of the law; pure he must be of thought, pure of word, pure of deed, not invoking the Dews;—and such, in the beginning, were the thoughts and acts of our first parents."

First they said, "It is Ormuzd who has given the water, and the earth, and the trees, and the beasts of the field, and the stars, and the moon, and the sun, and all things pure." But Ahriman arose, and rushed upon their thoughts, and beat down their good dispositions, and said to them, "It is Ahriman who has given the water," &c. Thus Ahriman deceived them, and even to the end will seek to deceive.⁹ To his lie they gave credence, and became Darvands; and, therefore, are their souls condemned to the Douzakh, even until the great resurrection of the body. During thirty days they feasted, and covered themselves with black clothing. After thirty days they went to the chase; and

⁶ "Les Ferouers sont comme l'expression la plus parfaite de la pensée du Créateur appliquée à tel objet particulier. Ils ont d'abord existé seul. Réunis ensuite aux êtres qu'ils représentoient, ils ont fait partie de l'âme des créatures, mais ils ne se disent proprement que des êtres raisonnables."—Note of Anquetil to p. 83, vol. i, of his Translation of the Zend.

⁷ "En même temps l'excellente intelligence porta aux hommes les Ferouers des hommes, et leur dit, Quel avantage ne retirerez-vous pas, de ce que dans le monde je vous donnerai d'être dans des corps! Combattez alors les Daroudj; faites disparaître les Daroudj; à la fin

je vous rétablirai dans votre premier état; vous serez heureux..... Ensuite le Ferouer de l'homme arriva dans le monde, y parut."—Boun-Dehesch, Zend. vol. ii, p. 350.

⁸ Vide p. 377-380, *ibid*.

⁹ Anquetil, at the foot of the page, gives this other reading, which more distinctly connects our destiny with that of Meschia and Meschiane: "Ce fut ainsi qu'au commencement Ahriman mentit (aux hommes) sur ce qui regardoit les Dews; et jusqu'à la fin ce cruel ne cherche qu'à (les corrompre); à cause d'eux (Meschia et Meschiane) les âmes seront en enfer jusqu'à la résurrection." Zandavesta, ut supra.

they found a white goat, and with their lips they drew off her milk, and drank her milk and were glad: "We have tasted nothing like to this milk," said Meschia and Meschiane; "the milk we have drunk was pleasant to the taste, very pleasant to the taste," and it was an evil to their bodies.

"Then the Dew, the liar, grown more bold, presented himself a second time, and brought with him fruit of which they ate; and of a hundred excellences which they possessed, one only was left them. And, after thirty days and thirty nights, they found a white and fat sheep, and they cut off its left ear; and, taught by the Izeds of heaven, they drew fire from the tree konar, and they fired the tree, and with their breath raised the fire to a flame; and they burned, first, the branches of the konar, then of the khorma, and afterwards of the myrtle; and they roasted the sheep, which they divided into three portions; and of the two which they did not eat, one, it is said, was carried to heaven,—the bird kehrkas carried it away."

"Afterwards, they feasted on dog's flesh, and they clothed themselves in its skin. They gave themselves up to the chase, and with the furs of wild beasts they covered their bodies. And Meschia and Meschiane digged a hole in the earth, and they found iron, and the iron they beat with a stone, and they made for themselves an axe, and they struck at the roots of a tree, and they felled the tree, and arranged its branches into a hut; and to God they gave no thanks: and the Dews took heart. Now become enemies, Meschia and Meschiane hated each other, and they advanced against, and struck, and wounded each one the other, and each went his own way: then from his place of darkness the chief of the Dews was heard to cry aloud, "Man worship the Dews!" And the Dew of hate sat upon his throne. And Meschia advanced, and drew milk from the bull, and sprinkled it towards the north, and the Dews became strong; and, during fifty winters, Meschia and Meschiane lived apart, and after that time they met, and Meschiane bore twins," &c.

In this legend, as in that of Genesis, we have the history

of the first ancestors of our race. *In both*, man is created pure and innocent; but, *in the one legend*, he is formed of earth, and is pure, because ignorant; while, *in the other*, he comes from God, or God's dwelling, "trailing with him clouds of glory," and is pure, because moral and religious.¹ *In both legends*, the eating of a particular fruit (*in the one*, it is the special food of the Elohim; *in the other*, it is a production of Ahriman) causes a great change for the worse in the condition of our race. According to Moses, however, *this is the one crime*, while, according to Zoroaster, this is *but one of a series of crimes*, committed by our first parents. *In both*, man is represented as yielding to the first temptation; and, *in both*, man, by his own fault, condemns himself to misery; but, *in Genesis*, man sins by disobeying an express command,—and he sins because tempted by a beast of the field; while, *in the Zend*, he sins against his conscience,—sins, because tempted by Ahriman, and sins by acknowledging Ahriman as the author of all good. *In this latter legend*, man is not created for this earth; and all things earthly, therefore, defile him; as he eats, he loses his spiritual nature;² and, as he acquires

¹ I draw this distinction between the Adam and Eve of Genesis and the Meschia and Meschiane of the Zend advisedly. In Genesis the man dressed the Lord's garden, and talked with his master as with his friend. He knew not good from evil, and he did not *tremble before*, and does not seem to have *worshipped* God, till after he lost his innocence. The first words of Meschia and Meschiane, on the other hand, are words of worship; they acknowledge their Maker and their God. They *cease to worship him*—and, as we learn from the Iescht of Taschter (Cardé vi): "Le Dew Epéoschô vainquit Taschter, éclatant de lumière et de gloire, qui s'enfuit du Zaré Voorokesché, à la distance d'un grand Hesar. Taschter, éclatant de lumière et de gloire, vit l'eau resserrée et violentée couler avec peine vers le midi; il me vit

opprimé, moi Ormuzd, qui suis la suprême force; il la vit opprimée, cette loi excellente qui est la lumière des âmes; et cela parceque l'homme, Meschia, ne m'avoit pas fait Izeschné en me nommant, comme les Izeds me font Izeschné en me nommant." —Zend. vol. ii, p. 191.

² I presume this from the fact that, in the course of ages, man is to return to his pristine food—water; and at length, when Sosisch appears, during the last year of the great millenium, will neither eat nor require food: "Dans le mille d'Oscheder-mâh, il y aura encore de la force dans la nature, mais elle diminuera. Les hommes passeront trois jours et trois nuits faisant Izeschné, et mangeant l'un avec l'autre, et se trouveront à la fin des tems. Ensuite ils cesseront de manger de la viande, et mangeront du fruit des arbres et du lait;

the mechanical arts of life, he but subjects himself the more to the power of the evil one. *In the former*, on the other hand, man is expressly made for this world; he possesses it as its lord, and he eats of its fruit, and does God service: and, if knowledge makes him miserable, it is because that knowledge, which is not instinct, is not of God's giving,³ and, therefore, cannot be for man's good. *In the one legend*, man is sent on the earth as to a place of trial; *in the other*, as to a place of enjoyment. *This*, then, punishes man sufficiently, by making him to feel his nakedness,⁴ by driving him out into the briery wilderness of the world, and by condemning him to return to the dust of which he had been formed; but, *in that*, no such punishment could avail: for, the weed-covered earth Ahriman had already corrupted and defiled; to the earth the pure Ferouer had been ordered but to try his courage and his truth: death then could have no terrors for the faithless servant: it could but lead him back to the pleasant odours, the beauteous exhalations, and the heavenly light of the happy Gorodman—unless, indeed, some terrible retribution awaited him beyond the grave. Yes, it was decreed, that he who worshipped the Dews, should suffer with the Dews,—he must sink down to the stench, the corruption, and the darkness of the Douzakh.⁵

puis ils quitteront le lait, cesseront de manger le fruit des arbres, et ne boiront que de l'eau. Ensuite la dernière année, lorsque Sosiosch paraîtra, l'homme ne mangera plus, et il ne mourra pas."—Boun-De-sch, vol. ii, § xxxi, p. 411.

³ According to the book of Enoch, "the angels who have commerce with the daughters of men teach them the secrets of Heaven;" and this is put forward as one of the reasons for the destruction of the world by the deluge.

⁴ In both legends, the first consequence of man's sin shows itself in the desire of clothing: the sense of shame induces it in Genesis, but the sense of cold, I suspect, in the

Avesta. For, having worshipped, our parents become subject to Ahriman, and Ahriman it is who has afflicted the earth with cold; and Ahriman it was who with cold drove the people of Ormuzd from Eeriene-Veedjoo: "Le premier lieu, la première ville, semblable au Behesch que je produisis, moi, qui suis Ormuzd, fut Eeriene-Veedjoo donné pur. Ensuite ce Péetiâré Ahriman, plein de mort, fit dans la fleuve qui arrosoit Eeriene-Veedjoo, la grande couleuvre, mère de l'hiver donné par le Dew."—Fargard i, Vendidad, Zend, p. 263.

⁵ For a description of Gorodman, see Nanu-Setaeschne xiii, Zend, vol. ii, p. 25: of the Douzakh,

vii. According to the Hindoos, all individual souls emanate from the one Supreme. As a portion of the Divine Essence, they are infinite, immortal, sentient, true. Each soul is also created free, and is, besides, originally invested with a subtle person, too subtle for restraint, and one which, though affected by sentiments, is incapable of enjoyment.⁶ And thus free and happy, our souls long lived as *dévatās* or angels, until persuaded by the Devas Moisasur, and Rhabun, we, out of envy and jealousy, fell away from the Deity; and thus lost our former happiness, and our purely spiritual natures. Our souls were now confined to, imprisoned in, bodies,⁷ grosser and viler in proportion to our crimes; and this world was created as our place of banishment and purification.⁸ Here we are thrown to suffer, but not without hope; mankind, the Deity made evident by his power occasionally deigns to visit, "appearing from age to age, for the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of virtue."⁹ On this earth,

Boun-Dehesch, p. 416; id.: of the resurrection and the reception which the just may expect, Fargard xix, vol. i, p. 418: "Les âmes des justes passeront le pont Tchinevad qui inspire la frayeur, accompagnées des Izeds célestes. Bahman se lèvera de son trône d'or; Bahman leur dira: Comment êtes-vous venus ici, ô âmes pures, de ce monde de maux, dans ces demeures où l'auteur des maux n'a aucun pouvoir? Soyez les bien-venues, ô âmes pures, près d'Ormuzd, près des Amschaspands, près du trône d'or," &c.

⁶ Colebrooke's *Essays*, vol. i, p. 238, 244.

⁷ In Menu the body is thus described: "A mansion with bones for its rafters, with nerves and tendons for cords, with muscles and blood for mortar; with skin for its outward covering; filled with no sweet perfumes, but loaded with fæces and urine; a mansion infested by age and by sorrow, the seat of malady, harassed with pains, haunted with darkness, and incap-

able of standing long. Such a mansion of the vital soul let its occupier always cheerfully quit; as a tree leaves the bank of a river when it falls in, or as a bird leaves the branch of a tree at its pleasure, thus he who leaves his body.....is delivered from the ravening shark of the world."—vi. 77-78.

⁸ Dubois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. ii, p. 309; Von Bohlen, *Das Alte Indien*, vol. i, p. 171; Rhode, *Heilige Sage*, p. 162; Id. *Ueber die ältesten Rel. des Morgenlandes*, Beiträge zur Alterthumskunde, i, Ht. 76; Languinais, *Relig. des Indous*, from the *Oupneek'hat*, *Œuvres*, vol. iv, p. 318. This origin of evil, which makes a part of the popular religion of India, is, we must observe, from the Shasta of Brahma, and not from the Vedas. The Vedas no where moot this difficult question, perhaps because with them all evil, like all separate existence, is but delusion.

⁹ *Bhagavat-Geeta*, by Wilkins, Lecture iv, p. 52.

then, the once-angel soul wanders, passing many births, and subject to successive transmigrations; now degraded to the form of a Pariah, and now united to the purer essence of God and Genii, but never wholly freed from the bonds of matter—never completely exalted above the possibilities of sin, and consequent abasement, until it loses its individuality by identification with the Divine mind.¹

According to the *Hindoo doctrine*, then, the body was formed for the soul; according to *Genesis*, the soul was given to animate the body: *in this* the world appears at its origin as a happy garden, in which wandered an innocent and joyous race; *in that*, it is held up as the Siberia of the heavenly empire, the purgatory in which rebel souls expiate past offences. *The one* accounts for the creation of a miserable and disorganised world; *the other*, for the woful change which has come over the fate and fortunes of mankind. *Both* are oppressed with the material, the physical, sufferings of Humanity; but *the former*, in the differences of caste and of fortune, finds some shadow of a previous glory; while *the latter* throws its curse, unqualified by any exception, uninfluenced by any hope, over our wretched race. *The one*, however, by the unknown crimes and unremembered virtues² which it punishes or rewards, sanctifies and perpetuates the condition in which the individual is born: and it induces *in the rich and happy*, the civilized classes, a Pharisaical self-content; and, *in the poor and suffering*, a slavish abasement. *The other*, on the contrary, recognizes no distinction between man and man;³ it finds

¹ Colebrooke, vol. i, p. 368; and Languinais, id. id. p. 338; and the whole scope of the Bhagavat-Geeta.

² "C'est aux mêmes causes qu'il faut attribuer les distinctions qu'on observe parmi les hommes. Les uns sont riches, les autres pauvres," &c. "rien de tout cela n'est l'effet du hazard, mais bien le résultat des vertus ou des vices qui ont précédé la renaissance."—Dubois, id. p. 309. "Jeder geborne Brahman, an dessen Körper sich vor seinem

sechzehnten Jahre irgend ein Fehler entwickelt, oder wer irgend ein Gebrechen mit auf die Welt bringt, aus seinem Kasten gestossen wird, da man jeden körperlichen Fehler als Strafe für Sünden des vorigen Lebens betrachtet."—Rhode, ſü. Religös. Bildung d. Hindus, vol. i, p. 219.

³ I speak here of the true Mosai-cal doctrine: the transmigration of souls and the belief that the misfortunes of this life were the punish-

us all equally miserable, and, unless it hereafter offer to us the pardon and the consolations of the Deity, all equally hopeless. *The first, then*, as it develops itself in the state, will appeal to the religion of the many to make them the slaves of the few; while *the second* will leave us slaves indeed of the Deity and of his priests, but will demand respect *not for the man*, but *for the laws*. *The one* will lean towards a paternal form of government, a tyranny; *the other*, towards a republic, of which equality, fraternity, is the basis.

Again, *according to Genesis*, God speaks his fiat, and our universe bursts into existence: but whether as God's first and best, or last and poorest, creation, Moses is silent. God, too, breathes upon the kneaded clay, and man steps forth a living soul,—and man dies, and his body returns to earth: but this bodily death, whether or not his soul survives, Moses leaves undetermined. A superior world and a future state, then, may coexist with, but are not necessary to, the religion of Moses. *According to the Vedas and the Zend*, on the other hand, this material, is created but as a pendant to a spiritual, world, and to one in which the souls of men are supposed to have been originally placed, and from which they are sent *to this earth* for the purification and destruction of evil; their births and deaths *here* are, therefore, but phases in their lives, phenomena to which their nature and the purposes of the Deity subject them. According to these books, then—first, a superior world, with its hierarchy of angels, thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers:⁴ and, secondly, the continuous existence

ments of crimes committed in some previous state of existence, because only in later times an article of the Jewish faith. Hence that question put to Christ: "Did this man sin, or his parents, that he was born blind?"

⁴ Cherubim are, it is true, spoken of in this chapter, angels too appear frequently in Genesis: and, accustomed to them, we do not find their appearance at all strange.

But attentively read the cosmogony of Moses, and you cannot help wondering how they come there. Their names at least are, by the Jews themselves, allowed to be Chaldean. R. Simeon Ben Lachish dicit: "Nomina angelorum ascenderunt in manu Israelis, ex Babylone. Nam ante dictum est, advolavit ad me unus *רפא* seraphim. Seraphim steterunt ante eum (Esaï vi). At post, vir Gabriel (Dan. ix. 21), Michael

of the soul under all changes (and, *according to the one*, these changes, manifold almost to infinity, may all take place on this earth; while, *according to the other*, they are limited but to a single life, which sends the soul to heaven or to hell), are essential and fundamental articles of faith.

Again, *these books* assert that this earth has been created for a particular object; the moment, therefore, that object has been attained, or is found unattainable, this earth of necessity becomes a useless blot in the creation. And to this earth, consequently, both Persians and Hindus allot a definite existence, one of 12,000 years,⁵ during which, according to the universal belief of the olden world, evil daily gathers strength, until, in the latter days, it shall overcome and tread under foot all good, and would finally annihilate it, did not the Deity, as he has promised in his mercy, send upon the earth a Saviour (Calci on the white horse, the tenth incarnation of Vischnu, and Sosiosch,⁶ the third and posthumous son of Zoroaster), who shall destroy the kingdom of the evil spirits, and restore good to its just supremacy, after which this world will be annihilated, and a newer and more beauteous one created in its place. Here, then, we have, as necessary consequences of the Hindu and Parsi cosmogonies,

I. A specified duration allotted to this earth. With the Jews also, this earth (for God may destroy what God has made) will one day perish. But the Jews, true to their narrow view of the Deity's character, show us their Elohim as destroying the world capriciously, arbitrarily,⁷ because the world pleases him not; while the Hindus and Parsis

princeps vester (Dan. x. 21)."—Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*. In *Evan. Lucæ*, i. 26.

⁵ These years are, according to the Persians, natural years; according to the Hindoos they are years of the gods, which amount to 420,000 of ours. Vide Von Bohlen, *Das Alte Indien*, vol. i, p. 171.

⁶ Vide *Asiatic Researches*, vol. i,

p. 236; and *Id.* vol. ii, p. 121. Calci, or Calenk, is described somewhat like him on the White Horse, in *Revelations* vi. 21; Sosiosch, like the Messiah, coming to judge the world at the last day. Vide *close* of *Boun-Dehesch*, and compare *Revelations* x.

⁷ Vide *Genesis* vi. 6; viii. 21; ix. 8-17.

represent their God as destroying the world, because he has so ordained it from all eternity.

II. The promise of a Saviour. Because this earth has been created for a particular end—to forward that end, to assure it, we have a Saviour promised us who shall restore man to his lost happiness and almost forgotten virtue. The Jews have also the same belief; but with them it is an after-thought, it does not naturally flow from their scheme of the creation. They seem to have borrowed it, and to have pared it down till it tallied with their own selfish views of the Divine Providence. They know of a political deliverer, a political conqueror only, a Jewish Mahomet. The Saviour of the Hindu and Zend books, on the other hand, is the Saviour of mankind—a Christ.

And III. The promise of another and a better world. When this world has been destroyed, a purer world takes its place. All are then purified, all made happy,—and the very principle of evil becomes good.⁸ Among the Jews we again find the same thought; but again defaced, mutilated. They, and with them the Judaical Christians, know only of a new Jerusalem, which a certain nation, men of a certain creed only, shall inhabit. Even beyond the grave, before the very throne of God, they cannot admit the humble but honest votary of another faith. Their separation wall is built for eternity.⁹

Again: to judge from these traditions, we do not view God and nature under the same aspect as did our forefathers. Because infant man but sees and reflects himself, to their God our first ancestors gave their own thoughts, feelings, views; and as their God was also a Creator, they assumed that because he was wise and powerful, he would produce only faultless works. And because man was his favourite offspring, if any one of his works, as, e. g. the world,

⁸ “Lorsque la fin du monde sera arrivée, le plus méchant des Durvands sera pur, excellent, céleste.” —Ha xxx, p. 164. And in the Fargard xix, we find Ahriman

inquiring after that pure world which was to give life, and had people and Shastah of Brahma.

⁹ Vide Revelations xiv. 3; and comp. Sale's Dis. Koran, iv, p. 125.

was created for man's use, they concluded that it would be accommodated to man's wants, suited to man's convenience, and, therefore, be a paradise, or a "*pays de Cocagne*."¹ But *such*, bitter experience taught them, the world was not. *To them*, nature seemed to cast man on a perilous shore, all naked, weak, and helpless,—to grudge him the very necessities of life, to wrestle with him, to oppress him. Their history was but a chronicle of hopes baffled, and endeavours frustrated; their memory but occupied with legends of cruel giants, and heaven-inflicted calamities; they knew only of devastating wars, or of lightnings, volcanoes, earthquakes, deluges.² In their eyes, the world was one of disorder and misrule, and man a deteriorating, retrograding animal. How, then, to reconcile what *was*, with that which *should*, or *must*, have been, created, became with them one of the great questions which priests and philosophers strove

¹ Thus the negroes on the Gold Coast will not believe that God has given them the gold, corn, fruit, &c., with which their country abounds: "Ils prétendent que ce n'est pas Dieu, mais la terre qui leur donne de l'or, quand ils prennent la peine d'ouvrir son sein; qu'elle leur fournit du maiz et du riz, mais avec le secours de leur travail; qu'à l'égard des fruits, ils en ont l'obligation aux Portugais, qui leur ont planté des arbres; que leurs bestiaux produisent eux-mêmes des petits, et que la mer donne libéralement du poisson. Ce qui n'empêche pas qu'ils ne soient obligés d'y contribuer de leur travail, sans quoi ils seroient réduit de mourir de faim, et, par conséquent, ils n'ont aucune obligation à Dieu de tous ces biens."....."Leur Dieu est noir et méchant, au lieu que celui des Européens est un très bon Dieu.....Dans leurs idées on n'a besoin en Europe ni de travail, ni d'industrie pour se procurer toutes sortes de commodités, et la prédication de Dieu pour les blancs leur fait trouver toutes leurs richesses au

milieu des champs."—Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. iv, lib. ix, § vii, p. 155. With these negro views compare the Tuba of the Mahomedan Paradise, from the boughs of which, as from the waistcoat-pocket of Peter Schlemihl's tall gentleman in black, one may take every thing one desires—birds ready roasted, asses and camels all saddled, turbans and silk-breeches, and whatever else "belongs to a frippery."—Sale's Preliminary Dis. Koran, p. 127.

² Thus, in Lucian, Timon appeals to Jupiter: "In your youth you were not to be trifled with; your bolt was in full practice, your ægis always in motion, your thunder always bellowing, and your lightning continually flashing hither and thither like darts in a skirmish. The earth quaked as if it had been shook in a sieve, the snow fell in lumps, it hailed rocky fragments, and the rain then poured down in torrents, every drop a river. Witness the great deluge in Deucalion's time," &c.—Timon. Tooke's Trans. vol. i, p, 33.

to answer; and a problem which they solved, either by giving to the Deity, as among the Hindus and Persians, some particular design in the creation of this earth; or by supposing, as among the Jews, that this world had once been all that man could imagine, till man's crimes brought upon it God's curse. With these views, their religion was necessarily a propitiatory service, one which sought to avert temporal misfortunes, God's punishments, and to ensure temporal goods, God's rewards; but one which dwelt little on moral excellence, and knew not of a spiritual world, the full beatitude of which should consist in the love and contemplation of the Divine perfections.

Ours, however, is another age; *ours*, other thoughts. We examine our globe; we see it, at its origin, a mere mass of water,—desert, lifeless. At length the voice of God is heard, and the water chrysalizes into granite mountains: the dry land appears, and with it a few zoophytes and creeping worms. For *awhile*, they alone inhabit the barren world, and *then*, swept away by some terrible convulsion, they give place to some more perfect, though still inferior, creation, which is itself but the precursor of another and more perfect one; till, after many revolutions,—a long space of unknown and undiscoverable ages,—the earth appears in its present beauty, a fit habitation for new-born man.³

We examine, also, the intellectual and moral world—the history of man. We see him at first ignorant and unpractised; wasting, because he knows not how to employ, his powers; pursuing his own vain wishes,⁴ and not the possible and attainable; opposing ever, instead of studying and directing himself by, the laws of God and of nature; ever, therefore, disappointed in his fondest expectations, yet ever stumbling on some useful invention, or on some great principle, which, though *he does not, his posterity will know how to wield*. We see him, besides, mixing and confounding together things of opposite natures, creating and

³ Cuvier, Discours sur les Révolutions de la Surface du Globe.

⁴ Hence charms and magic for-

mulas, and faith in astrology; and hence, too, the influence of wizards and conjurors on uneducated man.

putting out all his energies to give eternity to forms of society, which, because after a time they but accumulate and preserve error, are necessarily doomed to perish. Every where we see civilization succeed civilization, every where change, but every where also improvement. Yes; man, taught by his kindly mother, has at length risen up to conquer. Natural obstacles the natural sciences daily overcome, or turn to use; and moral and intellectual errors, though more slowly, the love of truth and self-study begin to dissipate; with every generation man learns to follow out some error to its source and through its consequences, and thus to destroy false associations, false virtues, false vices; and with every generation he records some new truth which withdraws his eyes from what is unimportant and immaterial, and fixes them on that which is alone vital and essential.

As, then, in the natural world, we see life first struggling in the zoophyte, then gradually developing itself through various stages, till it at length performs all its functions in man's more complicated organization; so in the world of Humanity, we find intellectual and moral excellence, (scarce breathing in the first and almost altogether animal men), more developed, and still developing itself, in their successive descendants: till, *in our day*, it begins to be *talked of* as, and *by future generations* will certainly *be made*, the end and object of life. *We*, then, look forward; *our ancestors* looked back: *our* life is one of hope; *theirs* was one of despair: *our* world is one of improvement; *theirs* one of deterioration. *Our* God, though his purposes we scarce venture to scan, *one in whom we have trust*; *theirs*, though his designs were familiar to them as their own, *one before whom they trembled*. *Their religion* was the adulatory service of a slave,—a cupboard worship; *ours*, on the other hand, is *nothing*, if not the aspiration after what is good and great: it is truth, peace, hope, and joy in believing, Christianity.

Verse 20. Eve, Chavah—living. By giving his wife a

name, Adam at once asserts that supremacy⁵ over her which Jehovah Elohim had promised him. The reason for the name was most probably found by the philological author of this legend.

Verse 21. For the milder climate of Eden, the leaf-apron, intended to cover merely, and not to give warmth to the body, was sufficient. For the colder world, however, our first parents must have some more substantial clothing: and God, therefore, before he drives them from paradise, makes coats of skins for them, or, as the rationalists would explain it, inspires⁶ them with the thought of making such coats for themselves.

According to Sanchoniatho,⁷ clothes were the invention of Usous, who made them of the skins of the wild beasts which he caught in the chase. And skins, though perhaps at first worn in a raw state, are so simple and evident a protection against weather, as to make it very probable that, in the colder and more variable climates, they were the first materials used for that purpose. But the raw skin, as it dries up, shrinks, and becomes hard and unserviceable,—an evil which the ingenuity of man must have been very early exerted to remedy; for scarcely a nation that clothes itself in skins has yet been found so utterly ignorant and barbarous, as to be without the means of rendering them soft,⁸ pliant, and durable.⁹ Thus the ancient Chinese, according to their histories, prepared their skins by merely taking off

⁵ If the woman's inferiority was not already implied first by her after-creation, and secondly, by the fact that *her* Jehovah never warned. Through her husband alone she seems to have learned that the fruit of the tree of knowledge was forbidden. We might say from chap. iii. 23, 24, she was *by right* the equal of the man; in *fact*, his inferior.

⁶ So Achilles collects together the Grecian force: *τῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θεῆε θεῶα λευκώλενος Ἥρη*.—Il. a, verse 55.

⁷ “ΟυσΩος, ὃς σκεπήν τῷ σώματι πρῶτος ἐκ δερμάτων ὧν ἰσχυσε συλλαβεῖν θηρεωννευρε.”—Sanchoniatho, Cory's Fragments, p. 6.

⁸ Of the aborigines of New South Wales (among the most ignorant and barbarous people existing) we are told: “their dress consists of an opossum or kangaroo skin, very neatly sewed together with the sinews of the otter.”—Hobart Town Almanack for 1837.

⁹ From the account of the expedition of the Viceroy of Egypt to Nigritia, given in the *Times* of

the fur with wooden rollers. And the ignorant Icelanders at this day manipulate the skin, and afterwards soak it in water, and then occasionally soften it with oil; while the North American Indians first soak the skin, yet warm, then clean, rub, and beat it till it becomes dry, and afterwards grease and smoke it to make it waterproof.¹ In a word, the preparation of leather is among the first arts which man acquires.

Verse 20. Had man eaten of the tree of life, nowhere forbidden him, before he tasted of the tree of knowledge, how had he been punished? Not by death surely, for in this verse Jehovah Elohim assigns as a reason for driving man from Eden, his fear lest man should "taste also of the tree of life, and live for ever." Is not the Jewish Deity here made to act somewhat absurdly? He places man in a garden with a tree of knowledge, and threatens him with death, if he taste of its fruit: and yet, near this very tree of knowledge, he plants a tree of life, of which should man eat, he lives for ever. This Deity owes it to an accident, then, that he is enabled to put his threat into execution.

Jehovah Elohim will not, truly, that man, now conscious of his weakness, helplessness, and ignorance, i.e. conscious of a state of existence far above that to which he has been destined, become "as one of us," a God. How bitter is the irony, worthy of some Pagan deity! Yes; notwithstanding that threat in Revelations,² against those who worship idols,—a threat, by the way, itself indicative of an idolatrous conception of the Deity, and of a false view of

July 4, 1839, it would seem as if in Nigritia the people were unacquainted with any means of preparing their skins.

¹ Goguet, *Origine des Lois*, vol. i, p. 115; and Lafitau, *Mœurs des Sauvages*, vol. ii, p. 32.

² Chap. ix. 20: "And the rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues, *yet repented not* of the works of their hands, that they

should not worship devils and idols of gold and silver.....which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk." The author forgets that the idols which for him neither see, nor hear, nor walk, are, in the eyes of their votaries, powerful deities. He judges those poor heathen by *himself*, his own views, his own morality; whereas, by *themselves* it is, that God will judge them.

the laws of Humanity—the Jehovah Elohim of Genesis is, in my eyes, as much an idol as the Maha Deo of those simple guides at Carli, who elicited the compassion of the pious Heber,³ or as the Boschman God, son of a Boschman, to whom the benighted Boschman prays, and to whom he looks for the flesh of the rhinoceros or the gemsbok.⁴ The fact is, that we all, because unable to apprehend God in his sublime purity, *more or less* worship idols (*barbarous man*, generally sensual idols, of which carved images in wood and stone are the fair representatives; *more civilized man*, idols of opinion, which show themselves in creeds, articles of faith, &c.); and we all, at the same time, worship God, if our Deity we only worship in spirit and in truth.

“And the Lord God placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword.” “At the east.” Adam then migrated to the east of Paradise; and the eastern quarter of the globe consequently (Michaelis⁵ supposes India), was first peopled.

“Cherubims.” In this verse we find the first mention of creatures which belong not to our world, though, as the flaming sword indicates, they must have been like ourselves, corporeal. *Here* they appear as the guardians of Eden, of God’s dwelling-place; *elsewhere*, however,—because in the ark over the mercy-seat, and in the temple within the holy of holies, two cherubims were placed with expanded

³ “At Carli we asked of our guides what deities the alto relievos represented. ‘These are not gods; one God is sufficient. These are *viragies*, devotees,’ was the answer we received. On inquiring further, if their god was the same whom they worshipped in the little temple before the steps, and if he were Maha Deo, they answered in the affirmative, so that their deism extended to paying worship to a *single idol only*.”—Heber’s Journal, Works, vol. iii, p. 112.

⁴ “Before any Boschman,” said Numeep to Sir James Alexander, “digs for water at Kuisip, he must

lay down a piece of flesh, seeds of the navas fruit, or an arrow, or any thing else he may have about him *and can spare*, as an offering to Toosip, the old man of the water.” Toosip he described as a great red man with white hair, and who could do them good and harm. He had neither bow, nor assegai, nor wife. They pray to him thus: “O great father! son of a Boschman, give me the flesh of the rhinoceros, of the gemsbok, of the wild horse, or what I require to have.”—Expedition into the Interior of Africa.

⁵ Michaelis, Comment. on Genesis, a. h. l.

wings, from between whom the Lord communed with Moses, —they are spoken of, *sometimes* as the supporters, bearers⁶ of the Elohim; *at others*, as the beings between whom the Elohim was supposed to dwell.⁷ In form, the cherub was⁸ like a winged and beautiful youth: according to Ezekiel,⁹ however, he was a sort of sphinx, or like the anca of the Arabians, or the griffin of mid Asia, or the fabulous beasts of the Persian creed,—he was part lion, part man, part eagle, part ox, having four wings, of which two covered his body, and two were stretched out to bear up God's throne: he was a symbolical being merely,³ Herder conjectures,—and a symbolical being *he may possibly be*, in the vision of Ezekiel; but a real living creature *he certainly is* in the Genesis of Moses.

Man's short day of happiness is past; he is sent forth, and the gates of Eden are closed upon him for ever. Is it not some tale, some tradition of a Paradise, that has at various times urged on the migrations of so many hordes?⁴

⁶ Hence Michaelis, ut supra, translates the word "Donnerpferde" *thunder-horses*; and compare Herder Geist der Ebraisch. Poesie vi. Gespräch. Vide 2 Sam. xxii. 11; and Psalms xviii. 10, &c.

⁷ Exod. xxv. 17, 20; 1 Sam. iv. 4; Isaiah xxxvii. 16.

⁸ Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraicæ, in Evan. Johan. xx. 12: "Cherubini erant instar puerorum recedentium a magistro." And Glassii, Philol. Sacra, lib. v, Tract. i, c. x: Cherubim, h. e., "imagines humanæ et alatæ."

⁹ Ezekiel i and x; and Selden, De Jure Nat. lib. ii, c. vi, p. 183.

¹ Bochart, Hieroz. lib. vi, c. xiv, p. 185. Musculus (following Josephus: "ζῶα πετεινα μορφήν οὐδενὶ τῶν ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων ἑωραμένων παραπλήσια.")—Antiq. Jud. lib. iii, c. 6) supposes the cherubim to have been birds, "volucres illas horribiles" (Glassii, Philol. Sacra. lib. x, c. x, De Angelis, p. 1664): Hoffman, monsters: "Unter Che-

rubs darf man sich nicht nach dem Wahn der Rabbinen....Engel darstellen, sondern wunderbar gestaltete Thiere" (Heb. Alterthum. p. 162): and Gesenius and Michaelis, snake-headed sphynxes; vide Gesenius, Comment. Jesaia, vi. 2, vol. i, p. 257; and compare Spencer, De Leg. Heb., De Origin. Arcæ et Cherubinatorum.

² Their name is legion. Vide Boun-Dehesch, § xix; and pictures of them in Chardin, Voyages, &c. vol. v.

³ Herder, ut supra, and id. ii. Ursprunge und Wesender Ebraisch. Poesie, vol. ii, § v; Werke zur Phil. and Gesch. p. 20.

⁴ So in the opening of the Edda, the king Gangler, proceeds on a pilgrimage to find that Asgarten, that palace of the world, in which man once dwelt. See Selbst eigene Vorrede des Eddas, p. 103, Schimmelman's Translation, and compare c. v and xxxvii, ut supra.

Has not man in his rude state, unmindful that things strange and marvellous please only so long as they are new, ever dreamt of some happy valley, some Eldorado, some island of Calypso,

“ *Reddit ubi Cererem tellus inarata quotannis,
Et imputata floret usque vinea,*”

—where, in an Epicurean ease, a luxurious excitement, he might rejoice in a merely animal existence? Or, if more advanced, has he not, with higher aims (but still struggling after the impossible, to find eternity in time, and spiritual purity in the midst of corporeal infirmity), gone forth a pilgrim warrior, to build up in some heaven-consecrated spot the new Zion? These vain hopes *we* no longer cherish:—Eden lies about us; heaven is in us:—for *us* the cherubim are empty spectres, the flaming sword an air-drawn dagger; but, for the untutored Hebrew, to whom a particular land was destined, and whose roving disposition was, therefore, to be checked, not encouraged—they were terrible realities: they rendered Eden unapproachable; and they so quailed the spirit of the most daring, that, throughout the Hebrew story, we hear of no migrations, no enterprises undertaken, for the purpose of finding and taking possession of that better land, which was man's birthright.

But why is it that our paradise is generally in the East, the land of memory, while our migrations have ever been Westward, towards the land of hope? When a child, was it not to you a pleasant thing to watch the setting sun? How happy, then, seemed that distant shore, over which was spread so gorgeous a canopy of purple and gold! How pale your own blue sky, before that of azure! Believed you not that its inhabitants were of a higher nature than ourselves: that them the sons of God indeed deigned to visit? Yes, it was the brightness of their wings that was so beautiful, as they expanded them ere they took flight to heaven. Why could we not, also, travel thither—you would inquire of your nurse,—we should be so near to God's throne, as scarce to need Jacob's ladder? And then her answer would fall so coldly on your ear, with realities

putting to flight its loved imaginations, again and again to return, till better knowledge, science, made of the living sun a dead mass, and of its attendant glories pestilential vapours. But, had you lived in earlier times, would not these thoughts, cherished by those around you, have grown with your growth? And would you not with others of your years, at length have set forth to realize them? You might have crossed rivers, and clomb mountains in pursuit of the ever-receding shadow, until, wearied with the length of the way, you pitched your tents in some pleasant places. But when age had chilled your blood and stiffened your limbs, and your children's children hung around your knees, the home of your infancy would then have risen before you—the cottage of your fathers a sumptuous palace; its vines and orchards rich in luscious fruit, its sky cloudless, yet, cooled by gentle breezes—an earthly paradise, over which memory threw a halo. Its beauties and its joys would be your theme; you would dwell on those happy days when you played naked on its sunny banks, and were not ashamed; and, as you spoke, you would point eastward to the garden in Eden.⁵

We will now finally examine these two chapters as connected with the laws of Moses, or with customs and modes of thought which prevailed in his nation. And,

I. We see that, *here*, the Lord is not merely the Creator, but the possessor of our earth, and that he distributes it among his creatures as seems to him good. (Exod. xix. 5; Deut. xxxii. 8.)

II. *Here* we also see the first evidences of that spirit of favouritism which, in after times, so essentially distinguishes the Jewish Deity. As from among his creatures he now chooses out man; so, from among man's descendants, he will choose out, first, individuals, then families, and then

⁵ I scarcely know whether the Indian Paradise, placed by Wilford in the west (Asiatic Researches, vol. viii), does or does not confirm my views. The original nations, and such are the Oriental, would have

their Paradise in that land to which they ever looked, the west; for evening is the time for contemplation: those who had emigrated, in that, most probably, from whence they came.

a nation; and, from this nation again, other families, and other individuals, on whom to heap his favours. (Deut. vii. 7; ix. 14, 15.)

iii. The favours of the Deity are here made conditional, (compare Exod. xix. 5): and we are shown that, if those conditions are not fulfilled, his punishments are terrible, and extend, not merely to the individual offending, but to his descendants (vide the latter part of the Second Commandment, Exod. xx. 5; Deut. iv. 26-27; and Deut. vii. 4). Compare Deut. xxiv. 16.

iv. Though there is little doubt but that the disgust which is universally induced by certain issues of the body, is the origin of that association of impurity which, in the Jewish creed is attached to those parts of the body from which such issues proceed (vide Levit. xv, and compare Boun-Dehesch and Dubois *Mœurs des Indes passim*); nevertheless, in that shame of their nakedness (ch. ii. 11.) which our first parents are made to feel, Moses, I conceive, sought to show to his people, that a state of nudity, the first glimmerings of reason must teach them, was *not* a state (however it might be permitted or required by the gods of other religions) *in which* to appear in the presence of the Lord. With this verse, then, I would connect the laws of decency (Deut. xxiii. 12-14, and xxv. 11, 12), and the ordinance respecting altars (Exod. xx. 26), and the four wings given to the cherubim and seraphim⁶ in Ezekiel and Isaiah, and which, I doubt not, were also found on those over the mercy-seat in the ark, and in the holy of holies in the temple,—viz. two wings, for service, and two to cover the body.

v. As here Eden, so afterwards in later times (Ezek. v. 5), Jerusalem,⁷ is presented to us as the centre of the earth.

⁶ Ezekiel, ut supra; Isai. vii. 2. and comp. Suctonius. Tiberius § 58. and the notes of Torrentius and Casaubon a. h. l.

⁷ Vide Gesenius, Comment. Isaiah ii. 2. With the Greeks this honour was given to Olympus;

with the Persians, to Albordj (Boun-Dehesch); with the Hindoos, to the golden Meru (vide "The Hero and the Nymph," Wilson's Hindoo Theatre, p. 240, note); and with the Arabians, it is usurped by Mecca.

Was not of Eden, guarded by cherubim, the holy of holies, God's earthly dwelling-place, more especially a type? On its doors, made of olive-tree, were carvings of cherubim, and palm-trees, and open flowers; and over the mercy-seat were two cherubim, from between whom the Lord addressed the high-priest. The temple was the earthly representation of the heavenly court of Jehovah,^s and, therefore, of Eden. (1 Kings vi.)

And vi. We connect the inferior condition of the woman among the Israelites, proved by the fact that she is an article of barter (see Exod. xxi. 7; Hosea iii. 2), and that polygamy was allowed (Deut. xxi. 15-17; and compare Deut. xvii. 17; Levit. xviii. 18; and Prov. xxxi. 1-31.)

^s Vide Gesenius, *Commentar. üb. d. Jesaiah*, vol. i, c. 6, p. 253-4.

CHAPTER IV.

GENESIS IV.

Verses 1-2. Eve bears two sons: the elder she names Cain (possession); the younger Abel¹ (breath, instability), a keeper of sheep. *The one* cultivates, occupies, possesses, the soil; *the other*, following his flocks, wanders over it. *The former* builds cities and lives his centuries, while to the latter is allotted but a breath of life. He is slain in the very prime of youth,² by his stronger and more lordly brother. It seems, then,

1st. That the names of these eldest born of the human race were indicative of their different occupations, and symbolical of their opposite fates; and,

2ndly. That the joyous words of Eve at the birth of Cain were prophetic; and that her prophecy was fulfilled, apparently in the very teeth of Jehovah,—who, as he doomed Cain to be a fugitive and a vagabond, surely never intended that he should possess the earth.³ One of three things, then (for the Hebrew books acknowledge no accidents), we must suppose: either—

1st. That to the progenitors of mankind was given an insight into futurity denied to us (the Jewish view, as the names of Noah,⁴ Japhet, and the blessings uttered by

1 "Abel—Hauch, Vergänglich-keit" (breath, transi- tiveness, instability), Gesenius, art. *Abel*, Ersch and Grubers Encyclop. "*Cain*," Gesenius explains by "speer—a spear;" which, with the usual etymology, would thus account for the two great events of his life; the spear, for the killing of his brother;

the possession, for the building the first city.

² Vide Gen. i. 28.

³ Vide verse 17, and compare with it the 25th verse of this chapter and the third verse of chap. v.

⁴ Bochart, Sac. Geog. vol. iii, p. 1. and compare Hermann in Sophoclem. Ajax. 425.

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, &c. clearly prove); i. e. we must suppose that the first men were in possession of powers of which we have been deprived: and that, consequently, *we*, in comparison with them, are but an inferior and degenerate race; an opinion which is so utterly at variance with the observation and the knowledge of the modern world, that we cannot a moment entertain it.

Or, 2ndly, that any bare name having been handed down to posterity, posterity, with that horror of ignorance which characterizes mankind, attached to that name (and hence with names are so frequently joined their etymologies) some legend which corresponded with its meaning: a conjecture in itself not improbable, but to which it may justly be objected, that, if it were correct, we should possess a fuller history⁵ of, and more copious information respecting, these antediluvian heroes.

Or, 3rdly, that the name was not at these early times given at the birth (and the words of Eve are then apocryphal), but in after life, when the man's character was formed, or his fate decided.

Verses 3, 4. "Abel brought of his flock, Cain of the fruits of the ground." In general, man offers to the Deity as a sacrifice a portion of that on which he himself subsists. He feeds his God with his own food, with the proceeds of his labour. *If a husbandman*, he eats of the fruits of the ground; and *if a shepherd*, of the produce of his flock: and, according as he is husbandman or shepherd, his sacrifice will be animal or vegetable.⁶

⁵ Yet De Guignes objects to the early history of the Chinese, and Malcolm to the Dabistan, because it is so meagre.

⁶ The Egyptians, in memory of the food and first sacrifices of their fathers, never entered the temples for the purposes of prayer but with the herb *agrostis* in their hands (Goguet, *Origine des Loix*, vol. i, p. 73). According to the Greek writers (vide Potter's *Antiq. of*

Greece), "in the first sacrifices, no living creatures, nor any thing costly, as perfumes, were used, but herbs and plants plucked up by the roots were burnt with their fruits and leaves; and even to Draco's time, the Attic oblations consisted but of the earth's productions." (Yet by the way, Lycaon offers a child, and Prometheus an ox to Jupiter; vide Pausan. *Arcad.* c. ii, § i; and Hesiod, *Theog.* p.

In general, too, man is generous to his gods, self-denying, in proportion to the difficulty with which he obtains a livelihood. Thus, the fishing and hunting tribes, whose pursuits are often attended with no little danger, and whose sustenance is precarious, are more devotional, make to their idols more frequent and richer gifts, than do the nomadic and pastoral⁷ races,—who, unknowing of want, and living entirely upon milk, are observed rarely to offer sacrifice; and who, when they do sacrifice, are seen themselves to eat up the best and fattest of the meat, and to throw to their gods the bones, skin, and other refuse.

In general, too, it will be found, that while *the act*⁹ of sacrifice belongs to barbarous man, *the art*, though made to rest on long-established custom, is one which, like all others, owes its rise to the agricultural nations. Thus, in the first times, any man may sacrifice;¹ afterwards, as individuals

535.) *The Chinese, on the other hand*, assert that in the olden time the great sacrifices consisted of animals: the ox, the lamb, and the boar (vide *Doctrine Chin.*, Mem. Chin. vol. iv, p. 55, note). *Among the Hindoos, too*, the great *ekiam*, or the immolation of a horse, and sometimes of a man (vide Dubois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. ii, p. 443), would induce one to suppose, particularly as abstinence from animal food is no where insisted on in the Vedas (vide Uttara Rama Cherita, Wilson's *Hindoo Theatre*, p. 340, with note), that the *Hindoo*s in olden times were also in the habit of offering animal sacrifices. In the *Zend*, the first sacrifice recorded is the oblation of that portion of the sheep which Meschia and Meschiane did not eat, and which was carried up to heaven (supra, p. 78), an animal sacrifice therefore. In the New World, among the *Peruvians*: "Le principal sacrifice étoit celui des agneaux, des moutons, de toutes sortes d'oiseaux bons à manger." (Hist. des Yncas, lib. ii, c. viii.) But wherefore all this? To show that the matter of

the first sacrifices differs according to the mode of life, habits, and food of different people.

⁷ Thus Sanconiatho makes the hunting and fishing races the inventors of charms and divinations (Vide Cory's *Fragments*, p. 9), while Meiners (*Gesch. der Religion*, vol. ii, p. 16, 17) shows us the Tartaric hordes and the negroes as niggardly in sacrifice; and Alexander thus speaks of the careless oblation of the Boshman: "He must lay down a piece of flesh, seeds of the nava's fruit, or an arrow, or any thing he may have about him and can spare." (*Travels in Africa*, ut supra). For the indifferentism of the Arabs in matters of religion, see Volney's *Travels*, close of chap. xxiii.

⁸ On the same principle, cities, nations, are represented in times of prosperity as neglectful of the gods; in times of danger, whether from plague, famine, or a foreign enemy, as loud in prayer, eager in sacrifice.

⁹ Vide Lafitau, ut supra.

¹ As Cain and Abel, not yet fathers of families.

grow into families, the father of the family only;² and soon, when families unite to form a city or people, particular families, or particular individuals, are set apart for that purpose. Again, in the earliest ages, any thing presented at any time, and any where, might be an offering to the gods;³ but soon the best of the corn and oil, the choicest of the flock or herd⁴ only are worthy of God's acceptance,—and then, too, they must be sacrificed at some appointed time, in some appointed place, and according to a certain ceremonial,⁵ or the sacrifice is an insult. At length man begins to believe that the richer the gift the more acceptable, and now is the era of hecatombs burnt in spices, and all the epicurism of a mighty priesthood.

Verses 4, 5. Abel's sacrifice was accepted, Cain's despised. Why was this?

1st. Because Abel's offering was rich and agreeable: Cain's poor and contemptible: is the simplest and most obvious answer,—and one, which, as it considers merely the outward and visible sign, we may term the purely Judaical;⁶ Or,

2ndly. Because Abel's *choice* sacrifice showed his respect for, Cain's *careless one* his contempt of, Jehovah;⁷—a solution which, because it regards the outward and visible sign as the evidence (though according to some prescribed rule), of an inward and spiritual grace, i. e. because it judges the man before God, not by himself, but by his

² As in the patriarchal times. And thus in China: "Le droit d'offrir sur le Tan appartenait au seul souverain, exclusivement à tout autre, le grand sacrificateur de la nation."—*Mémoires des Chinois*, vol. ii, p. 15.

³ Vide Potter, ut supra; Lafitau, ut supra.

⁴ Vide Leviticus, passim; Feithii, Homer. Antiq. lib. i, c. ix; and Animadver. in Feithium, p. 18.

⁵ Vide Leviticus and Deuteronomy, passim; and remember the lands, trees, forests, and lastly

temples, dedicated to the gods in the Greek superstition. Vide Feithius, lib. i, c. iii.

⁶ From Luther's commentary on this passage. Malachi i. 8; and Leviticus xxii. Under this head I would also class that interpretation which supposes Cain's sacrifice to have been rejected because it was eucharistic; Abel's accepted, because it was a sin-offering. Vide Dr. Clarke's Commentary.

⁷ From Philo-Judæus. See 1 Samuel xv. 22; and compare id. xvi. 7.

actions, and those actions again, by any moral or religious standard, and not always by that standard which he whose actions are thus judged recognises,⁸ we may term the Christo-judaical. Or,

3rdly. Because Abel and Cain approached Jehovah, *the one* with a pure and holy, *the other* with a proud and wicked heart;⁹—an answer which, as it directs the view to the inward and spiritual grace, the man himself: as it judges the man before God by himself, and not by any other standard, we may term the purely Christian.

Of these answers, we may observe that they are all conjectural; that the text is either only not contradictory of, or, at best, but feebly warrants them. For instance, *the two first* would seem to rest upon the very different manner in which the sacrifices of the brothers are spoken of; *the one* offering of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof; *the other*, merely of the fruits of the ground. Yet, if we turn to the books of the law, we find that while with *animal* sacrifices some words of choice are almost invariably associated, *vegetable* are almost as invariably spoken of as first fruits only. The eulogy coupled with the offering of Abel appears, therefore, as a customary form merely; while its omission before that of Cain neither proves that his gift was a paltry one,¹ nor that he had been neglectful in its selection. To *the third*, on the other hand, it may be objected that, though quite consonant to right reason, and to our views of the character of the Deity, it is—

⁸ *e. g.* Among the Greeks, the Athenians chose for sacrifice animals sound and without blemish. The Lacedemonians offered often defective ones, out of an opinion that so long as their minds were pure their external worship could not fail of being acceptable. The Christian Jew then looks at the Lacedemonian sacrifice with an Athenian eye, judges it with an Athenian mind, and never takes into account the principle which actuates the sacrificer.

⁹ St. Paul, Heb. xi; Stäudlin Gesch. der Moral Jesu, vol. i, p. 81.

¹ Luther, in his Commentary (ut supra), has already remarked that we have no evidence of Cain's having offered an unworthy sacrifice: "Aufs erste soll man nicht dafür halten das Kain ein geringer Opfer gethan habe denn Abel, denn es sind die besten Früchte gewesen; und wenn man die Opfer in Mose ansehet, sind die Speisopfer fast die edelsten unter allen Opfern." The word here used is "Minchah," also used and explained in Leviticus ii. 1. See, on this matter, Clarke's Commentary.

1st. Altogether unsupported by the text, which, though it distinctly states the occasion of Cain's crime, omits all mention of any previous wickedness in Cain which might induce Jehovah to reject his sacrifice. And,

2ndly. It is not in accordance with the notions which the Jews held of their God, Jehovah. He is gracious to whom He will be gracious, He has mercy on whom He will have mercy.² He puts aside Ishmael and Esau,³ and blesses Isaac and Jacob; He chooses out Israel to be his peculiar people; He has his preferences, his favourites; and these are selected often for no moral reason, but merely because He so wills it;—and because He so willed it, I believe, and for no inferiority in Cain or his sacrifice, “He has respect to Abel and his offering, but unto Cain and his offering He has no respect.”

Verses 5, 6, 7. How knew Cain that his sacrifice was rejected? Probably, answer *some*, fire came down from Heaven (as once when Abraham sacrificed) and burnt up Abel's offering, but left Cain's untouched. Truly, it is easy to explain away a difficulty by the aid—either of a miracle, as the supernaturalists;⁴—or of one of those happy accidents, in this case a flash of lightning, which, though natural, are more extraordinary than miracles; *as the rationalists.*⁵ Of both one might, however, ask, how and where they learned that the offerings of Cain and Abel were precisely burnt offerings?

How, then, knew Cain that his sacrifice was rejected? Probably, answers *Michaelis*,⁶ by the failure of his next harvest. What! is it conceivable that a narrative so carefully arranged as to make a pause between the wrath of Cain and the murder of Abel, should thus have crowded into one and the same scene the several months which

² Exodus xxxiii. 19. So the Allah of Mahomet: “He forgiveth whom he pleaseth, and punisheth whom he pleaseth.”—Koran, c. v, Sale's Translation.

³ Vide Malachi i.

⁴ Luther, Commentary on Genesis; and the orthodox generally.

⁵ Eichhorn, Bruchstücke über die Heil. Schrif. Bibliothek der Bib. Lit. vol. iv, p. 1072.

⁶ Commentary on Genesis.

necessarily intervened between Cain's sacrifice and his knowledge that that sacrifice had not been accepted? If words have a meaning, the thing is impossible.

But how knew Cain that his sacrifice was rejected? For a moment put aside Jewish prejudices,—*for a while* leave the beaten track of long-established opinion:—read this legend as you would the account of Prometheus' sacrifice at Mecone;⁷ read it as though you read it for the first time, and to simple words be content to give a simple meaning: and then, two brothers dwell near to Eden, Jehovah Elohim's pleasure garden;⁸ on a certain day they take, *the one* of the fruits of the ground, *the other* of the firstlings of his flock, and bring them, according to oriental custom, as gifts⁹ unto their Lord. Abel, and his gifts, Jehovah receives favourably; but “unto Cain, and his offerings, he has no respect.” Cain, thus neglected, is wroth; his countenance falls; his eyes are fixed on the earth. Jehovah, however, notes his anger, sees his thoughts, and at once rebukes and warns him: “And the Lord said unto Cain, why art thou wroth? why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, so lookest thou up; but thinkest thou evil, beware, so lurks already sin at the door, waiting thy nod. But thou rule over it.”¹

⁷ Hesiod, Theog. 535.

⁸ Genesis iv. 16; and compare with it Gen. iii. 8.

⁹ Michaelis, Varianten im Prophet Jesaiah, vol. xiv, p. 146, Orient. Bib.

¹ I have generally followed a translation in Eichhorn's Bib. d. Bib. Lit., which, however, differs but little from those of Michaelis and De Wette. I subjoin them:—

“Hebel opferte seiner Heerde Erstlinge.
Und Gott blickte auf Hebel und sein Opfer,
Aber auf Kain und sein Opfer blickte er nicht,
Und Kain zürnte!
Es sank sein Gesicht.
Und Jehovah sprach zu Kain,
Was zürnest du? Was sinkt dein Gesicht?
Wenn du gut bist, kannst du wohl aufblicken.
Denkst du aber auf Böses?
Siehe! so laurt vor der Thür schon die Sünde;
Du aber beherrsche sie.”

Otnar, Bib. d. Bib. Lit. ut supra.

Compare, however, Köhler's Verbesserungen der Leseart in einigen Stellen des Alt. Test., Eichhorn's Répertoire, vol. ii, p. 244.

Michaelis

"Cain and Abel then came into the very presence of Jehovah?"

Listened not Jehovah *curiously* to Adam's yet unpractised language? Talked He not with him as with a friend? Was He not wont, too, to visit his happy creatures in the cool of the day? And when they sinned, by disobedience, did He not himself pronounce their sentence? Why, then, should not Cain and Abel approach Him? They were, indeed, banished from Eden, but not from God's presence; and God's presence the very words in which this scene is told presume: "And Jehovah *looked not* on Cain and his offering; and Cain's countenance fell. And Jehovah said, Why is thy countenance fallen?" Are not these expressions just such as would be used; nay, are they not expressions *such as could only be used*, of two persons standing³ face to face?

"But the idea is absurd?"

Absurd with our conceptions of the Deity; but not absurd either in the eyes of Moses or of his people. Was

Michaelis thus renders the passage: Ver. 6. "Und Jehovah sprach zu Kain: Warum bist du so ezürnt? und warum hängst dein Gesicht zur Erde? Ist es' nicht wahr wenn du gutes thust, so kannst du die Augen in die Höhe heben? wenn du aber das Gute nicht thust so liegt die Sünde vor der Thur, und sie hat Lust zu dir. Du sollst aber über sie herrschen." —Uebersetz. d. Alt. Test.

De Wette, thus: "Da sprach Jehovah zu Kain: Warum bist du zornig und schlägst den Blick zur Erde? Nicht wahr, wenn du gutes thust, so blickest du auf? und wenn du nicht gutes thust, so liegt vor der Thüre die Sünde, und hat Verlangen zu dir; aber du herrsche über sie." —Uebersetz. des Alt. Test.

Dr. Clarke, following our authorized version in other parts, thus translates the latter portion of this passage: "But if thou doest not well, a sin-offering lieth at thy

door," *i. e.*, "an animal fit to be offered as an atonement for sin is now couching at the door of thy fold."!!!

² Gen. ii. 19; iii. 8, 17.

³ Compare Cain and Abel's with Noah's sacrifice. *There*, an altar is built, and beasts and birds are offered as burnt offerings on the altar, and the odour of the sacrifice rises even to the Lord's nostrils; *here*, we find nothing of all this, none of the formulas of sacrifice. In Asiatic Researches, vol. ii, p. 116, 119, Sir W. Jones, in the sacrifice of Swayambhuva, or, Son of the Self-Existent, finds a parallel with the sacrifices of Cain and Abel; and at that sacrifice the Deity is represented as being present, but present by descending from Heaven. The tenor, however, of the narrative in Genesis will not admit of the supposition that Jehovah comes to Cain and Abel; they it is who approach him.

it not their firm belief, that, in the holy of holies of the first temple, Jehovah was wont to show Himself to the high-priest in a cloud darkly?⁴ And, although in these latter and degenerate days, the consecrated—the chosen, of a chosen race alone—dared to look upon the Lord, and *then* only upon the Lord in His veiled glory; and although even to Moses it was not given to see His face:—yet, if we go back to earlier times, we find that Jacob wrestled with God,⁵ and that Abraham walked with Jehovah on his way to Sodom.⁶ Is it not, then, natural to conjecture, that, among the first men, when sin and wickedness had not yet driven the gods from the earth, the Lord was supposed by Moses to have lived like a father among his children? Is not this conjecture, moreover, confirmed by the parental tone of the warning to Cain, and the cry of Cain when he is doomed to be a fugitive and a vagabond: “From thy face shall I be hid”?

If, however, this interpretation be objected to, because it supposes, in Genesis, false and narrow conceptions of the Deity (which, as it is an inspired book, it never could have sanctioned), then have I little to answer. I can but observe that, in this case, the word of God necessarily changes its hue and form with every succeeding age; and that, while *in other works*, it is the reader’s business carefully to study the author’s thoughts and views, in order that he may fully understand their meaning; *in this one*, he has but to keep before his eyes the opinions and reputed truths of his own time and country, in order to force the text into some conformity with them.

Verse 8. This first quarrel,⁷ observe, was a religious one: Cain kills a brother to rid himself of a formidable

⁴ Leviticus xvi. 1, 13; and Exodus xxxiii. 18, &c.

⁵ Genesis xxxii. 24, &c.

⁶ Genesis xviii.

⁷ Of the twins borne by the mother of mankind, according to the Iroquois legend, we are told that

they fought together: “Ils avoient des armes inégales, dont ils ne connoissoient pas la force; celles de l’un étoient offensives, et celles de l’autre n’étoient point capable de nuire; de sorte que celui-là fut tué sans peine” Lafitau, vol. i, p. 93.

rival in his God's favour. "Ne voilà-t-il pas un beau début," says a French wit; "ils ne sont que trois ou quatre au monde, et ils s'entretuent déjà! après cela que pouvait espérer Dieu des hommes, pour se donner tant de peine à les conserver?"^s Crimes, terrible as those which brought destruction on Sodom and Gomorrah, are daily enacted. *The savage* enslaves, or torments to death, and then sometimes eats the stranger who falls within his power. *The eastern despot*, that he may know no taste of fear, like Abimelech of old, slays his threescore and ten brethren. *We, however, the civilized of the earth*, are content with more peaceful vices. We make a wordy parade indeed of our intolerance and our bigotry: but our social envy, or sectarian hate, seldom displays itself in any thing worse than a few acts of petty spite and malice. Or, we rejoice in that respectable epicurism which, while it wraps itself up in its own comforts, wonders that others shiver with the cold. And yet the world is still preserved, and preserved, no doubt, because, though crime may be rife, crime is not on the ascendant, and daily loses ground. Yes, like Cain, we too are criminals; but, like Cain's, our penitence, our horror of crime, is greater even than our crimes.

Verses 9-16. Man's first crime was disobedience; his second, murder. For both crimes, the punishment awarded, is, in part, the same—banishment,—*in the former case*, from Eden, God's garden, His holy of holies; *in the latter*, from the earth, man's home, and the outer court of God's temple. *For the one crime*, however, the earth, and not the criminal, is cursed; and so long, consequently, as the earth is, the curse endures. *For the other*, the criminal himself was cursed; and all his hopes, therefore, must prove abortive, all his enterprises unsuccessful—but, with him, the curse stops: it does not extend to his descendants; they may sin on their own account, and be punished for it; but they do not suffer for the sin of their father.

We may observe, by the way, that the punishments

^s Malherbe. Vide Tallemant des Réaux Mems. vol. i, p. 158.

inflicted in both cases are wholly temporal; though, perchance, in the shame of Adam hiding himself from the presence of the Lord: and in the assurance which Cain requires from Jehovah, that in every man he shall not find the avenger of Abel: it is darkly intimated that the punishments which God here pronounces as a judge, are punishments such as the law inflicts—some additions to that misery which necessarily proceeds from crime itself, and which is purely mental.

“And it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me, shall slay me.” These words surely indicate, not merely that Cain acknowledged the justice of the *lex talionis*, but that it was the law generally recognized and acted upon⁹ in his time. Yet, in the sixth verse of the ninth chapter, we find an account of the institution of this law: which, with the others then made, seems intended as a check upon the imaginations of man’s heart. How are these discrepancies to be reconciled?

1st. We may avoid them, by following Michaelis’ version of this text: “Alles was mich antrift,” every thing, i. e. every wild beast¹ which meets me, &c. But I find this translation unsupported by any other authority. I find, too, on referring to his notes, that Michaelis prefers it, not because it better renders the Hebrew words, but because it is more conformable to what he supposes to have been the then state of the world and of mankind.² It is, therefore, a merely conjectural translation. It is, besides,

⁹ Indeed, Dr. Clarke knows all about it: “In the antediluvian times,” he says, “the nearest of kin to a murdered person *had a right to revenge* his death by taking away the life of the murderer;” and he adds: “this, we have seen, contributed not a little to Cain’s horror.”—Commentary on verse 23.

¹ See Commentary on this passage. Michaelis, Bibel.

² “Hier ist nicht von Menschen die Rede: Wie sollte Kain die anzutreffen fürchten, wenn er sich

aus dem bewohnten Lande weg, und in die Wildniss begab? Das menschliche Geschlecht....wohnete damals beisammen. Desto grosser aber war die Gefahr, dass er von der Hülfe seiner Nebenmenschen entfernt am ersten Tage die Beute der wilden Thiere werden würde,” &c. Vide Anmerkung. zum erst. B. Mose, iv. 40. One might also inquire how a man could be far removed from his fellow-men whose first act was to build a city?

one which makes the answer of Jehovah incomprehensible : for, by what mark could brute beasts be taught not to attack Cain ? and what sevenfold vengeance could God take upon them ? This objection Michaelis foresees, and answers, by referring to the well-known practice of the olden world,³ which punished, even on the beast, the death of the man, i. e. he answers it by referring to the *lex talionis*. We must, therefore, again ask, how are these discrepancies to be reconciled ?

2ndly. We may suppose the *lex talionis* to have been a relic of antediluvian legislation, which, only after the deluge, received the sanction of the Deity. But how is it conceivable that this *lex talionis* (limited, when delivered to Noah, to cases of violent death by the hands of another) should, as a human institution, be, not merely not sanctioned, but actually rejected by Jehovah ; and then afterwards issue from his lips as his especial law—and that too, immediately after he had swept away a world of men from the face of the earth, because their imaginations were evil ?

But how, then, are these discrepancies to be reconciled ? Let the strictly orthodox divine answer the question. I see in them but the unsteady and inconsequent views of infant man, which I feel no way obliged to receive, though they teach me, indeed, how slowly, and with how great difficulty, the human mind developed its notions of the Deity.

We will now examine the interpretation which the rationalists give to the events that follow the murder of Abel.⁴ No sooner, say they, has Cain slain his brother,

³ “ Auch dis ist der Schutz Gottes nach der ersten Denckungsart der Menschen ausgedruckt, die den Tod der zerrissenen Menschen auch an den Raubthieren rächen werden, ob diese gleich keiner eigentlichen Strafe fähig sind. Noch nach der Sündfluth redet Gott eben so, ja er giebt ein eigenes Gesetz, alles was Men-

schen blut vegiesse, es sey Mensch oder Thier, wieder zu tödten.”—*Id. id. v. 15.*

⁴ Eichhorn's *Urgeschichte*, Repertorium, vol. iv, p. 190, 224, &c. In exemplification and corroboration of their views, both as regards their explanation of the banishment from Eden and this tale of Cain, the Rationalists might quote

than the thought rushes on him, that he will be called upon to account for his brother's non-appearance. But, *as* infant man ascribes every unexpected event, every unaccountable accident, to the immediate influence of his gods; so he connects every thought, not elicited by something outward and visible, with the only invisible object with which he is acquainted—the Deity. Hence Cain's reproach of conscience appears as the searching question of Jehovah, "Where is Abel thy brother?" But, again, because in these early times language is yet unable to distinguish between the thought (i. e. the words of the heart), and the words (i. e. the thoughts of the lips), all thoughts are described as something uttered; hence, the thought acknowledgedly drawn from the resources of his own mind, with which Cain meets that other thought suggested by Jehovah, naturally enough takes the form of an answer to it. "Am I my brother's keeper?" But the once awakened conscience is not thus easily quieted: it calls up before the eyes of the terrified criminal, the earth yet reeking with the blood which he has shed,—he remem-

the following anecdote :—The Fuegians believe that "a great black man is always wandering about the woods and mountains, who is certain of knowing every word and every action, who cannot be escaped, and who influences the weather according to men's conduct. York related a curious story of his own brother, who had committed a murder: "In woods of my country," said he, "some men go about alone; very wild men; have no belly (meaning, probably, very thin); live by stealing from other men." He then went on to say that his brother had been getting birds out of a cliff, and on coming down, hid them among some long rushes, and went away. Soon afterwards he returned, and seeing feathers blown away by the wind from the spot, suspected what was going on; so, taking a

large stone in his hand, he crept stealthily towards the place, and there saw one of these wild men plucking a bird which he had got out of the cliff. Without saying a word, he dashed the stone at the wild man's head, and killed him on the spot. Afterwards, York's brother was very sorry for what he had done, particularly when it began to blow very hard. York said, in telling his story: "Rain come down; snow come down; hail come down; wind blow—blow—very much blow; very bad to kill man; big man in woods no like it; he very angry." At the word "blow," York imitated the sound of a strong wind, and he told the whole story in a very mysterious manner, considering it an extremely serious affair."—*Voyages of Adventure and Beagle*, vol. ii, p. 180, *Quarterly Review*, December 1839.

bers the sin of his father, and its punishment,—and he hears Jehovah pronounce his doom: “And now art thou cursed from the earth. . . . When thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.” And Cain, fully sensible of the misery which awaits him, now cries out, “My punishment is greater than I can bear;” and “every one that findeth me shall slay me.” But, again, a new thought strikes him, in which he finds consolation:—If I who have slain my brother be punished, will not the man who slays me be punished also? This thought he also attributes to the Deity, who then seems to assure him, “That whosoever slayeth him, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold.”

To sum up the whole in a few words: the rationalists assert, that this dialogue, in which Jehovah bears so large a part, merely describes, according to the language of the young world, the various and contending emotions which by turns occupied the mind of the conscience-stricken Cain. And if, by this interpretation, they but mean to account for the origin and actual form of our legend, and, at the same time to justify the good faith and honesty, either of those who, for so many centuries, treasured it up in their memories; or of Cain, who, we will suppose, himself first told the tale; no one will deny to their views some probability, and to themselves much critical acuteness. But if they go further; if they contend that the author who first transcribed, and they who repeated to him this legend, were all fully aware of its true meaning, then I must object to their interpretations: first, as supposing in infant man too matured and calculating a judgment:⁵ and, secondly, as directly counter to the opinion of the author of Genesis, who gives objective reality to the whole scene, by the words in which he concludes it. “And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him.”[†] Yes; as I interpreted the first act of this drama, so I must interpret the last. The author of Genesis believed that every thing took place

⁵ Vide ut supra, p. 24.

really, actually, as he states it; that Jehovah personally accused, and personally sentenced Cain.

Verse 16. "And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord."⁶ Cain travels still further eastward, and dwells in the land of Nod,—exile, banishment. Was its name given to this land previous to Cain's crime, and did it then influence the legend which records his fate? Or was the land so called after, and because, Cain settled there?

Cain went out from the presence of the Lord.

When He would judge our first parents, Jehovah Elohim is represented as calling them before him. He is shown us, too, coming down⁷ after the flood,⁸ "to see the city and the tower which the children of men had builded," and we meet him tarrying in Abraham's tent, ere he sets forth to destroy Sodom. Again, when the Lord⁹ (called the angel of the

⁶ According to Herodotus, lib. i, § xxxv, the Phrygian, Adrastus, for the accidental murder of his brother, flees for purification to Cræsus. According to Euripides (Hippolytus, verse 35), Theseus, after the just and necessary slaughter of the Pallantides, exiles himself from Athens, to avoid the contamination of their blood (*μιασμα φευγων ἀμαρτος*); and Wachsmuth (On the flight of Peleus, Hercules, and Orestes, each on account of a murder), observes "that though they fled, and not without a design to evade the penalty of retribution, yet that the chief impression by which they were actuated was, that

divine punishment would surely overtake the man who should omit to effect his purification or expiate his crime by flight" (Hist. Antiq. of Greece, vol. i, p. 135). With this ancient notion of expiation may we not connect that law of Athens and Rome, which permitted the guilty citizen to fly from the hands of justice, provided sentence had not yet been pronounced upon him? (Casaubon, in Sueton. Julius Cæsar, § xlii; Monk. in Hippolitum, v. 37, Euripides). And when we call to mind the flight of Cain, the city of refuge, and the scape-goat, may we not ask whether some analogous view did not once obtain among the Jews?

⁷ Thus Apollo: "Βῆ δὲ κατ' οὐλυμποιο καρήνων."—II. a, verse 44.

⁸ So Virgil describes the gods assisting in the destruction of Troy:—

"Neptunus muros, magnoque emota tridenti
Fundamenta quatit, totamque a sedibus urbem
Eruit. Hic Juno Scæas sævissima portas
Prima tenet.....
Jam summas arces Tritonia, respice, Pallas
Insedit, nimbo effulgens et Gorgone sæva,
Ipse Pater Danaïs animos viresque secundas
Sufficit: ipse Deos in Dardana suscitât arma."

Æneid. ii, 610.

⁹ Dieser Engel redet, v. 15, so dass Man ihn nicht wohl für etwas

Lord), meets Hagar in the wilderness, do not her words denote her surprise, that even *there*, in that desert place, the Lord should have seen her?¹ And when, on his road to Haran, Jacob in a dream sees Jehovah, the God of Abraham and of Isaac, what, on waking, is his exclamation? "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not." In the conception of the infant world, it seems, then,

1st. That *where* God acts and works, that *there* He is regarded as immediately and personally present. And,

2ndly. That He is supposed to prefer the cultivated field,² the tents and haunts of men, where He receives offerings, and is gratified with worship, to the desert,³ where there are none to do Him service.

geringeres, als für den wahren Gott halten kann."—Michaelis, Com. zum. Gen. xvi, 7.

¹ Vide Michaelis' Translation and Commentary: "Hier in dieser Wüste! Eine Erscheinung des wahren Gottes hätte sie ehe in dem Hause Abram's erwartet, aber nicht an diesem bisher gar nicht für heilig gehaltenen Orte."—Id. v. 13.

² Hence in the Persian faith: The well cultivated earth is well-pleasing to Ormuzd, and agriculture is a duty. For, according to the Zend, the *Dews multiply* when the land is left waste: "Lorsque Ormuzd ne donne pas le laboureur, les Dews sans nombre se multiplie" (Ha xxxi, p. 168); and are weakened when grain is abundant: "La

vaste gueule et l'énorme poitrine du Dew seront brulées lorsque le grain sera en abondance." (Fargard iii, p. 284.) Somewhat analogous to this was the opinion of the ancient Egyptians, who made the sandy desert the habitation of Typhon; and of the Hindoos, who believe that the waste Kobi, and the barren mountains of Thibet, are the chosen dwelling of the evil spirits. Vide Gesenius, Com. ü. d. Jesaiah, i, p. 464; and Rhode, Heil. Sag. 93, and compare Tobit viii. 3; and see Eisenmenger's Entdeckt. Judenthum, vol. ii, c. 8; which shows that the same opinion prevailed among the later Jews.

³ So among the Greeks. The gods loved the abodes of men, where they might feaston hecatombs. There:—

"Δαινυνται τε παρ αρμι καθήμενοι, ενθα περ ήμεϊς."—Odys. η, 203.
—and avoided willingly the barren sea; so at least Mercury tells Calypso (Odys. ε, 99):—

"Ζευς εμε ηνωγει δεϋρ' ελξεμεν ουκ εδελοντα:
'Τις δάν έκων τοσσονδε διαδραμοι άλμυρον ύδωρ
Ασπετον; ουδε τις αγχι βροτων πολις, οίτε θεοισιν
'Ιερα τε ρεζουσι, και εξαίτους εκατομβας."

And, as the Elohim forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh (Ps. lxxviii. 60), and hurried away from those cities which were doomed to destruction; so, too, on the approach of the Per-

sians, the Divinity abandoned the Acropolis of Athens (Herod. lib viii, §. 41); and when Tyre was besieged by Alexander, a Tyrian saw Apollo deserting the city: and the

I conclude, therefore, that Cain was literally understood to have gone out from the presence of the Lord,⁴ when he left the home of his father, and dwelt in an unknown and uninhabited country.

We will now inquire into the state of man, and the degree of civilization which he is represented as having attained, in the year of the world 128.

Abel was a keeper of sheep. A part of the animal creation, sheep,⁵ for instance, man had already tamed and domesticated; a task which required some observation, some forethought, and a certain labour; and one, the results of which were neither sure nor immediate, and for which, as our antediluvian ancestors did not, or, at least, were not permitted to, eat flesh, they scarcely seem to have had any sufficient inducements. What, however, may have been these inducements? To them sheep were useful,

1st. For the purposes of sacrifice. "Abel offers of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof;" and, till the time of Enos, according to one interpretation given to the 26th verse of this chapter, sacrifice seems to have been the only religious service.

2ndly. For the purposes of food. They drank of the milk of their flocks. And milk, with its preparations of butter and cheese (for both of which the milk of sheep, though not abundant,) may be used, forms at this day the principal food of most nomadic tribes.⁶

Tyrians, to keep him there, chained his statue to a pedestal (Diod. Sic. lib. xix, p. 520).

⁴ So Zeus was supposed to be especially present in Dodona: "Homer wie Hesiodus nennt den Zeus 'National Gott der Pelasger,' und Dodona war der Ort wo sie ihn besonders gegenwärtig glaubten."—Schlosser Gesch. d. alt. Welt. i, 305.

⁵ The Argali, or Mouflon, considered by Buffon and Pallas as the original of our common sheep, is described as a remarkably shy and wild animal, loving the highest and most inaccessible rocks. To tame, therefore, the first sheep,—and not

one, but several, for Abel had a flock,—must have been a work of considerable difficulty.

⁶ Burckhardt says of the Turkomans: "Their manner of living is luxurious for a nomadic people. They taste flesh only upon extraordinary occasions, such as a marriage or a circumcision. Their usual food is bourgoul. This dish is made of wheat, boiled, and afterwards dried in the sun, in sufficient quantities for a year's consumption. Besides bourgoul, they eat rice, eggs, honey, dried fruit, and sour milk; they have none but goat's milk."—Appendix to Syria, p. 638.

3rdly. For the purposes of clothing. Though for Adam and Eve Jehovah Elohim made coats of skins, he left their children to make coats for themselves. But as the raw skin soon shrinks, and becomes hard and unserviceable, we must presume, if the first men continued to wear skins, that they had either themselves discovered, or had been taught by Jehovah, some means of preparing the skin, and rendering it fit for the purposes of clothing; and, as the coats of Adam and Eve were their model, that they had, moreover, learned in some way to adapt the skin to the shape. In other words, we must presume that our first ancestors possessed a knowledge of several of the arts of life, which, though no doubt among the most simple and necessary, are still unknown to many nations.

II. Cain was a tiller of the ground.⁷ The Chinese historians thus relate the labours and experiments of Yen-ti, the inventor of agriculture: "He tasted every wild plant he could meet with. *Some* he found injurious to the health, and these he sought to exterminate; while others possessed medicinal properties, of which he determined the use. Of the different grains which might serve for the food of man, he chose out the most nutritious. He distinguished five principal sorts; of these he advised the cultivation, in preference to the rest, which he considered as less useful. He selected, also, one hundred kinds of fruits, and planted in an inclosure ("fit planter à part") the several trees which bore them. But, defeated in his object, he learned, after the experience of some years,⁸ that it was not merely necessary to plant trees, but that they required more and other attention: that attention he gave them. He now regulated his mode of treatment according to the seasons, and the soil,

⁷ Michaelis somewhere expresses his surprise that Genesis makes no mention of him who first planted wheat. As it takes for granted that man always possessed domestic animals, so it presumes that he always knew the use and value of those grains which constitute his principal food.—Vide Genesis i. 29; iii, 18.

⁸ This relation accords well with

the simplicity of the olden time, which heaps ever upon one man the experience and the knowledge which generations only can acquire. That Yen-ti is made to do what is impossible does not impugn the antiquity of the narrative, but rather strengthens it. The forgeries of civilized times are never so impossible and absurd.

his mode of treatment according to the seasons, and the soil, and the nature of the trees themselves. He thus invented tillage, agriculture, and the other labours of the field.”⁹

The author of our Genesis is not so explicit as the Chinese historian. He asserts merely that Cain was a tiller of the ground. Cain, then, must have known that some plants were edible and more wholesome than others; he must have perceived that certain wild grasses, wheat, for instance, might by culture be so improved, as with but little preparation to become food fit for man. He must have observed the soils and situations these grasses delighted in: with a provident mind he must have gathered their seeds, and ascertained at what period of the year these seeds should be put into the ground: and, that nothing might check their growth, he must, at the same time, have learned (probably the only tillage of these early times, and the only tillage the virgin soil¹ required) to tear up and clear away all weeds, and thus to soften the earth, and prepare it to receive his more useful grains.

But not to mention that these eldest born of Adam each represent one of the *two* great races into which, in the time of Moses, mankind was divided: the *tillers of the earth*, the first founders and inhabitants of cities, and the fathers of all mechanics and artizans; and the *keepers of sheep*, the pastoral and nomadic tribes:—is it, I would ask, conceivable, that the few individuals then existing should, without any traditional knowledge, and in the course of one short century, have acquired the diversified experience which their different occupations presume? Is it conceivable, that the first men should thus have strode onward to civilization: when, after six thousand years, we find that, of *their descendants*—*some nations* continue so unimproved that they, like Adam, cultivate the earth literally by the labour

⁹ Vide Mémoires des Chinois, vol. i. p. 45, &c.

¹ The negroes on the Gold Coast merely burn the grass on the lands they mean to cultivate; and then, with a rude spade (of which a draw-

ing is given in vol. iv. p. 200, Hist. Gén. des Voyages), they turn up the ground; having sown their seed, they never weed, but cut millet and tares together.—Hist. Gén. des Voyages, vol. iv. p. 130, 131.

of their hands,²—*others*, so improvident, that on the first warm day they burn the huts which have sheltered them from the cold of winter,³—*others* yet so brutish, that, living alone, and hiding in holes and hollow trees, they can scarcely be said to possess a language,⁴—and, lastly, *others* yet so destitute, that they have no tame animals,⁵ or are unacquainted with fire and its uses?⁶ No, it will be answered, this rapid advance is not conceivable under ordinary

² “Pour semer le millet les nègres mettent un genouil à terre, font des petits trous, y jettent trois ou quatre grains de leurs semence—et bouchent chaque trou de la même terre.”—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. iii, p. 117, 188; id. vol. iv, p. 120, &c.

³ “Their habitations (in California) are small round huts of rushes, erected where they halt for a season, and burnt when they change their station.”—*California*, by A. Forbes, p. 186.

⁴ “D’autres encore vivoient dans des fosses et dans le creux des gros arbres.....et ont à peine une langue pour exprimer leur pensée aux autres, quoiqu’ils soient d’une même nation; de sorte qu’ils vivent comme des animaux de différentes espèces, toujours éloignés les uns des autres sans jamais communiquer ensemble.”—*Garcilasso de la Vega*, *Histoire des Yncas*, lib. i, c. xii, p. 27. See also account of the Fuegian language by Darwin, *Voyage of Adventure and Beagle*, vol. iii, p. 228.

⁵ *Robertson’s History of America*, lib. iv. p. 323—of many American people. Among the inhabitants of the Mariane or Ladrone Islands, Magellan found no animals save a few doves.—*Hist. Gén. des Voyages*, vol. x. p. 366. “The Nameguas say of the Damaras, that they keep nothing to kill, and not even dogs to catch the fawns of the springbok, as the Boschman do.”—*Alexander’s Travels in Africa*. And of

some Fuegians Captain Stokes narrates, “that the tracks they inhabit are altogether destitute of four-footed animals, and that they have not domesticated the geese and ducks which abound there. Of tillage, he adds, they are utterly ignorant; and their only vegetable productions are a few wild berries and a kind of sea-weed. Their principal food consists of muscles, limpets, and sea-eggs, and seal, sea-otter, porpoise, and whale.”—*Voyage of the Adventure and Beagle*, vol. p. 75.

⁶ “Les habitans des Iles Mariannes, découvertes en 1521, n’avoient aucune idée du feu; jamais ils ne furent plus surpris que quand ils en virent lors de la descente que Magellan fit dans une de leurs îles. Ils prirent d’abord le feu pour un animal qui s’attachoit au bois et qui s’en nourrissoit. Les premiers qui s’en approchèrent trop s’étant brûlés, leurs cris inspirèrent de la crainte aux autres, qui n’osèrent plus le regarder que de loin. Ils appréhendirent la morsure d’un si terrible animal, qu’ils crurent capable de les blesser par la seule violence de sa respiration.” (*Hist. Gén. des Voy.*) “Les habitans des Philippines et des Canaries aussi ...de los Jordanos, plusieurs peuples de l’Amérique, et, entre autres, les Amikouanes.”..... “L’Afrique offre encore de nos jours des peuples qui sont dans la même ignorance.”—*Goguet, Origine des Lois, des Arts et des Sciences*, vol. i, p. 69.

circumstances: not conceivable, if, in opposition to all antiquity which ascribes the first and necessary arts of life to the gods or to deified men, we suppose the first man, like Condorcet's statue, suddenly awaking into existence, and, by the force of his own energies, and unassisted by divine Providence, fighting his way up to civilization: but very conceivable, if, taking the Hebrew books for our guides, we place him in an Eden and allow him a frequent intercourse with the Deity, and give him the beasts of the field for his subjects, and make him to keep the garden and to dress it:—for then, we may presume, that whenever he shall lose this paradise, whenever he shall be driven forth into the common world, he will bring with him into his new habitation, not only the arts and the knowledge which, as necessary to his duties, he must have possessed when in Eden, but also not improbably those animals which there best loved and most frequented his society.

But it may in this case be objected to us, that, according to these books, Adam's sojourn in Eden was so short, that,—unless that knowledge, and those arts which in all time have been the results of frequent observation and constant practice, were in him intuitive; and unless the nature of the animals which followed him, judging from those of the same species now found wild, was, for his sake, especially changed,—our hypothesis is impossible. And if, to maintain it, we find no difficulty in subverting the regulated course of God's providence: we shall still have to show to what end and purpose God thus violated his own laws,—since the condition of many nations even in this our age *proves* that, *for them at least*, these laws were violated in vain, and the records of almost all the great people of antiquity *prove* the same thing *for mankind*. For these records, while they speak of a period of darkest ignorance, mention at the same time with honour *the inventors*⁷ of those very

⁷ See the Generations of Sanchoiatho, Cory's Fragments, p. 6, &c. The Chaldeans, according to Berossus, ascribed all sciences and arts to a sort of monster Oannes, who came among them and instructed them.—Cory, id. p. 23. The Greeks record the gods, or god-inspired men who invented the necessary arts of life. The Egyptians also;

arts which *we* would consider as relics saved from that great wreck in which man lost virtue and happiness together.

Verse 17. Cain begets a son, Enoch (the instructed, dedicated, initiated). The name which Cain gives his son presupposes certain religious customs, the dedication of children, probably the eldest born, to God; and the dedication of them for a particular purpose, that they might be instructed, initiated, in the mysteries of God's service; that, in a word, they might be his priests.

Cain, too, builds a city: "Le premier qui a semé un grain de blé a fondé les empires," was wont to say the father of Mirabeau. And men, no doubt, began to unite and form themselves into communities, and to settle down in some fixed habitation, so soon as agriculture afforded them the permanent means of subsistence. Not inaptly, therefore, is Cain, the husbandman, made the first founder of cities.

But Cain calls his city Enoch, the dedicated. Enoch was then probably a holy city—a city which, like those of Egypt,⁸ was merely an appendage to a temple; or which, like Rome, was at once a sacred city and a city of malefactors.⁹ For a city, however, are required not merely earthen walls and mud huts,¹ but also inhabitants—and inhabitants living

(Diod. Sic. vol. i, p. 3); and the Chinese: *Mémoires des Chinois*, vol. i, lib. iii, p. 149.

⁸ "The Egyptian nomes, at their origin, were appended to the temples. Every new settlement of the priest class, with the territory that formed it, constituted one of these nomes."—Heeren, *Egypt* c. ii. "Il y a ceci de particulier pour certaines villes de l'ancienne Grèce, qu'au lieu de s'être formées autour d'un château, elles se sont fondées autour d'un temple. Telles étoient les villes de Delphos et d'Olympie. C'étoient des espèces de villes sacrées, auxquelles le temple qui en étoit le centre servait de sauvegarde."—Granier de

Cassagnac, *Hist. des Classes Ouvrières et Bourg.* c. iv.

⁹ "La cité commence par un asyle: 'vetus urbes condentium consilium.' Mot profond, que la situation de toutes les vieilles villes de l'antiquité et du moyen âge commente éloquentement."—Michelet, *Hist. de Rome*, vol. i, p. 94. And De Cassagnac, *ut supra*, observes, "que la cité d'Ilium est appelée *sacrée*, parcequ'elle servait d'asyle."

¹ Though the ancient inhabitants of Peru lived, and the Bushmen of the present day still live, only in holes and hollow trees, the construction of huts is among the earliest and simplest of human inventions. Thus

under certain laws and institutions. Whence then came the inhabitants of Enoch, for the country was desert and uninhabited?

If we suppose, first, that this city was founded some years, say one hundred and thirty, after the birth of Enoch, its inhabitants may then very well have consisted of the children and descendants of Cain, who, according to Dr. Clarke's calculation, might in that time amount to twelve hundred persons.² And we then suppose,

1st. That the antediluvian men knew neither disease nor sudden death.

2ndly. That though they never began to have children before they were sixty-five years of age, and, in this respect, consequently, were subject to other laws than ourselves: that, nevertheless, the period of gestation was the same as now, and that they had a child every year.³

And 3rdly. That, with a barren soil,⁴ little agricultural skill, and no fit implements of labour, they increased more rapidly than do in our day the most intelligent colonists of the most civilized people, under the most favourable circumstances.

And if we suppose, secondly, that the inhabitants of Enoch were criminals—refugees, like Cain, from the happy

the inhabitants of Port Philip, New South Wales (among the most barbarous of any people yet discovered), have huts. "Their habitations are of the readiest construction, being composed of the branches of trees, laid with tolerable compactness, inclining to an apex, at an angle of about forty-five."—Hobart Town Almanack for 1837.

² Vide Commentary on Genesis chap. iv. 15.

³ Yet Noah, at 500 years of age, has but three children, and one hundred years after that time he has still, to all appearance, the same number only. We must not forget, however, that the human species propagates itself more rapidly at some periods than at others. After the black plague of the four-

teenth century, the continuator of William de Nangis observes, that the survivors "*se marièrent en foule. Les survivantes concevoient outre mesure. Il n'y en avoit pas de stérile. On ne voyoit d'ici et de là que femmes grosses. Elles enfañtaient que deux, que trois enfans à la fois.*"—From Michelet's *Histoire de France*, vol. iii. p. 349.

⁴ "The earth shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength," &c. That Cain and his immediate descendants possessed little agricultural skill is a fair and probable conjecture; and that they had no fit implements of labour we know, because, until Tubal-Cain, the instructor of artificers in iron, such instruments could have been made but of wood or stone.

land near Eden,—and that Enoch, like the cities of refuge, (cities also of priests,⁵) was built for them;—then we suppose, that men, who could not tame down their wild passions to the simple duties of a family, should, with the world before them where to choose, voluntarily submit to the policy and tedious regulations of a city; i. e. we suppose that the outcast Indian, like the London vagabond, prefers New York to the vast woods around him, where he may live and wander free and unconstrained.

Verses 18-22. Of Cain's posterity, the sons of Lamech are distinguished; one of them as the father of such as dwell in tents, &c.; another as the father of such as handle the harp and the organ; and a third, Tubal-Cain, as the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron;⁷—and the sister of Tubal-Cain was Naamah. Willingly as we treasure up even such scanty records as we here find of those who stand amidst the herd of men as the inventors of useful and pleasing arts—who is there peruses these antediluvian fragments, that lingers not with some feeling of curiosity and surprise over the name of the only woman of a former world whose parentage is known? Wherefore has it been preserved? Adah and Zillah, the wives of Lamech, are the mothers of men who have deserved well of their fellows. It is in their ear, too, that Lamech pours his plaint—to them he confesses his crime: and woman stands forward, even in the world's first age, as man's best comforter. But Naamah?⁸ She lived, and died, not un-

⁵ Such also were our churches and cathedrals in the middle ages. So true it is that in all time man but repeats an old lesson—but copies himself.

⁶ Fourmont finds an identity between the generations in Sanchoniatho and these generations of Cain. See the beginning of his *Anciens Peuples*, vol. i.

⁷ According to one Greek myth, the Dactyli, the first workers in iron, were also the inventors of music; and the cymbal was the first

musical instrument. But Pan, one of the old divinities, plays on the reed; and the Peruvians, though unacquainted with metal instruments, used a sort of Pandean pipe, (*Hist. des Yncas*, lib. i, c. 26); and the Otaheitans and Sandwich Islanders the drum; and I think it probable, that, as in *Genesis*, music was invented before the art of working iron was discovered.

⁸ Fourmont says she is the first Venus, and that, as it was customary in these early times for brothers and

known, not unheard of; but, on what was founded her fame,—a fame of sixty centuries? Was it on deeds of love or hate?

“And Lamech took unto him two wives.” By the fathers Lamech was judged an adulterer: he was looked upon as the first man, and the only one before the deluge, who ever had two wives. It is not probable, however, that Moses, in whose eyes Jacob was certainly no criminal, should have thought thus hardly of Lamech; particularly as he seems to have mentioned the number, and the names of Lamech’s wives, merely to render intelligible the subsequent address of Lamech to them.

Verses 23-24. I will not pretend to explain this passage, for I do not understand it. Some of the many translations of it, almost all of which have a different meaning, I will give. If the words be read interrogatively, the passage runs thus, according to Dr. Clarke.

“And Lamech said unto his wives
Adah and Tsillah, Hear ye my voice;
Wives of Lamech, hearken to my speech;
Have I slain a man, that I should be wounded?
Or a young man, that I should be bruised?
If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold;
Also Lamech seventy and seven.”⁹

Another translation from the same source runs thus—

“For I have slain a man *for wounding me,*
And a young man *for having bruised me.*”

sisters to marry, she married Tubal-Cain or Vulcan. (Fourmont, *Antiens Peuples*, vol. i, p. 44.) Vossius, among other conjectures of which Naamah has been the subject, mentions that she has been supposed to be Minerva, and also Venus, as her name implies beauty; and that the very angels were so taken by her beauty that they cohabited with her, and the produce of their union were certain devils

called *Sedini*.—De Orig. et Prog. Idol. lib. i, c. xvii. See Eisenmenger’s *Entdecktes Judenthum*, vol. ii, c. viii, p. 415-16.

⁹ From Dr. Clarke’s Commentary. The meaning which Dr. Clarke attaches to this translation is that, I presume, which is found in the last paragraph of commentary to verse 23d. If it be the true meaning, what becomes of his notes on the sixth chapter?

Geddes renders the passage thus :

“ A man I have killed ! but to my own wounding :
A young man ! but to my own bruising.”

—De Wette,¹ thus :

“ If I slew a youth with wounds,
And a young man with blows,” &c.

—Michaelis and Luther,² thus :

“ I have slain a man to my wounding,
And a son to my hurt,” &c.

—Voltaire,³ thus :

“ I have slain a man by my wounds,
And a young man by my bruises,” &c.

—Marginal reading, thus :

“ I have slain a man in my wounds,
And a young man in my hurt.”

Verse 25. In the first verse of this chapter, we have the origin of the name of Cain, *gotten, possessed* : because, at his birth, Eve said, I have gotten a man from Jehovah. In this verse we have the origin of the name of Seth, *appointed, just* ; “ For Elohim,” she said, “ hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel,” &c.⁴ If, now, from the ominous words which fixed the name of Seth, we separate what is superfluous and unnecessary to the name,—if we read them simply thus, “ For Elohim hath appointed me a son,” it will seem that Eve expressed, at the birth of both her eldest and her youngest son, exactly the same sentiment ; save that, in the one case, she called the Deity Jehovah, and, in the other, Elohim ; and that she spoke of herself, at the one time, as having received, at the other, as having been presented with, a son.

¹ Schriften des Altes Test. übersetzt v. Augusti und De Wette :—

“ Wenn einen Jüngling ich schlug mit Wunden
Und einen Jüngling mit Beulen,” &c.

² Michaelis and Luther :—

“ Ich habe einen Mann erschlagen mir zur Wunde,
Und einen Sohn mir zur Beule.”

³ Voltaire, *Génèse* : “ J’ai tué un homme par ma blessure, et un jeune homme par ma meurtrissure.”

⁴ So in Homer the mother is represented as giving the name to the child :—

“ Ἀρναίος δ’ ὄνομα’ ἵσκει το γὰρ θετο ποτνια μητήρ
Ἐκ γενετῆς.”

Odys. xviii. l. 5.

Verse 26. "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord:"⁵ otherwise translated, "Then began men to call themselves by the name of the Lord."⁶ If we take the *first translation*, then following out the view I have supposed Moses and his time took of the relations in which God and the first men stood together, the meaning of the passage would be,—then began men, no longer permitted to approach Jehovah's person, to call upon his name, to address him with prayer, to invoke his protection.⁷ If we prefer the second,—and if we take the expression, "to call themselves by the name of the Lord," in a good sense: it will then signify, that the worshippers of Jehovah began to distinguish themselves (ch. vi. 20) from the rest of mankind as the sons of God;⁸—if, however, in a bad sense: then it will mean, that men now began to profane the name of the Lord, by blaspheming it, or by invoking it lightly, or by applying it to things that are not God.⁹ Of these two last interpretations we may observe, that *the second* has a limited sense, that it merely asserts man's wickedness; but that *the first* includes *the second*: for the sons of God would scarcely distinguish themselves from the children of men, unless these latter, by their profane and irreligious lives had driven them to it.

In reviewing this chapter, we may observe,

1st. That, throughout *it*, with the exception of the 25th verse, the Deity is named Jehovah; whereas, in the first chapter, He is called Elohim, and, in the second and third, Jehovah Elohim.

2ndly. That *it* presents the same view of the Deity,

⁵ English version, Luther's, De Wette's.

⁶ Marginal reading, Clarke's version, Michaelis.

⁷ It seems to me that the name Enos—which, as opposed to *Isch*, man generally, and *Adam*, an earth man,—signifies a man of sorrow, a wretched, miserable man, favours this meaning. Vide Luther on this verse; and comp. Eichhorn, *Einleit. in das Alte Test.* vol. iii, p. 125.

⁸ Vide Michaelis, *Commentary*, ad h. l.; and Dr. Clarke's *id.*

⁹ "Tunc profanatum est in invocando nomine Dei, i. e. nomen Dei rebus creatis impie tributum est; ita vertit *Seldenus noster*, *Paraphrasten utrimque secutus et Rabbinos*, qui locum de novorum Numinum initiis intelligunt."—Marsham, *Canon Chronicon*, p. 54; see also Dr. Clarke's *Commentary* on the Holy Scriptures.

and of His intimate relations with man, and of the causes which disturbed them, that did the second and third chapters.

3rdly. That, *like the second and third chapters*,¹ *it* both notes the inventions which take place in the arts of life, and the individuals to whom they are due: and at the same time it presupposes a certain degree of knowledge and civilization as intuitive in man.

4thly. That, like these chapters, *it* dwells upon the etymologies of names.

5thly. That *it* contains a poem, or the fragment of a poem, which, in all probability, is not the production of the author of the chapter, but one of those songs which, handed down from father to son, live on the lips and in the memories of a people, and which are, perhaps, the first histories.

With this chapter, we may connect those of the laws of Moses, which refer to offerings of first fruits, both of the ground and of cattle. (Vide Levit. ii. 14; Numbers xviii. 17; and Lev. vii. 23.)

II. The laws relating to manslaughter, and the cities of refuge. (Vide Numbers xxxv. 12; Deut. iv. 42-3.)

As parallels to the preference which, in this chapter, Jehovah shows to Abel, we may refer to the choice of Shem before Japhet, of Isaac before Ishmael, of Jacob before Esau, and of Levi and Judah before the rest of their brethren.

¹ Chap. ii. 20, 23; iii. 7, 21.

CHAPTER V.

GENESIS v. 1-32.

Verses 1-5. Our history now retraces its steps, and taking up the creation of man by the Elohim, described in the 27th verse of the first chapter, proceeds to detail the generations, the progeny, of Adam through Seth.

“In the day God created man, in the likeness of God made he him.....and he called their name Adam.....and Adam begat a son in his own likeness after his own image.” As Seth was born after the fall; and as he was born the image and likeness of his father; and as the history, before it proceeds to mention his birth, recapitulates the creation of Adam, and the likeness after which Adam was made; is it not natural to conclude that that likeness Seth also bore, that he too was made in the image, and after the likeness, of the Elohim?¹

But what was this likeness? Again I say, a corporeal one. The son is stated to be begotten in the likeness of his father, and his father to be created in the likeness of the Elohim. If words, then, have a meaning, unless they be mere juggleries, the terms, used to express the similitude between the son and the father, and between the father and the Deity, being the same, denote, in both cases, the

¹ Yet Dr. Clarke, with whom my reasons would probably have had as little weight as his have with me, takes the very opposite view of the matter. “This account,” he says, “is again introduced to keep man in remembrance of the heights of glory whence he had fallen; and to prove to him that the miseries and death consequent upon his present state

were produced by his transgression, and did not flow from his original state. *For, as he was created in the image of God, he was created free from natural and moral evil.* As the deaths of the patriarchs are now to be mentioned, it was necessary to introduce them by this observation, in order to justify the ways of God to man.”—Comment. ad. h. l.

same kind of similitude. Now, the son may be like the father, either in form and feature, or in character; or, in both form and feature, and character. If he be like him, either in form and feature alone, or in both form and feature, and character, my position is proved: and the Deity, in the Jewish conception of Him, had form, or, in other words, the Jewish was not the universal God.

But the son may be like the father in character alone. Now we may use the word character in two senses. In *the one sense*, it will denote the particular development of any individual man, his peculiar modes of feeling, thought, expression, conduct, &c.,—and in character, in this sense, a son may aptly enough be said to be like his father,—though in character, in this sense, no man, unless we would rush into the most determined anthropomorphism, can be said to be like God. In *the other*, it will express the distinctive mark of our race, our moral sense, our reason, our Humanity; and, as it then indicates *that* in us which is infinite and eternal, *that* in us which may, perchance, be a dim reflex even of the great Creator, we may truly be said to bear, as applicable to character in this sense, the likeness of the Deity:—but in character, thus understood, can a son be said to be *like* his father?

If, now, we receive the likeness of the father to the Deity in the only sense in which it can be intelligible to rational man,² we cannot, without repeating a most puerile

² Yet to character in this sense I very much doubt that any of our divines apply that likeness of himself which the Deity is said to have imprinted on Adam. No, they do not so apply it, or surely they would not speak of man as “fallen from the heights of glory;” for, though he may have little morality, and be most brutishly ignorant and thoughtless, and wholly occupied with material objects, yet (unless he have, indeed, lost his Humanity), he still possesses the same infinite soul, the same reason, the same moral sense he ever did. No, they

do not so apply it; or they would not speak of an original sin, which, as it has not deprived us of that glorious likeness we must ever bear, can denote merely those obstructions of time and situation, constitution and circumstances, (the curse on the earth, the liability to death according to Moses), that turn away man from his natural course, and prevent him from moulding his life on, or even apprehending, the divine model within him. No: according to them, when Adam’s individual development took a form other than that

truism, speak of a similar likeness as existing between father and son—as such a likeness will merely express, that a man begot a man, and neither a demon nor a monkey. If, on the other hand, we take the likeness between the son and the father in its only natural sense, and then apply the same sense to the similitude said to exist between the father and the Deity: then we have a merely human Deity, and neither the God of Moses, but as He is one and alone, nor his creed, but as it is one and exclusive, much differs from either the Gods or the creeds of many other nations.

But though man begets man, yet it not necessarily follows, it could not be known, that the first, the created³ man, also begot a man. Hence it was obligatory on Moses, and no vulgar truism, to inform us that the begotten son was essentially like to the created father. This objection might have some weight, if Seth had been the first-born of Adam; or, if we could conceive that the abstract man—man independent of this flesh, these passions, all accidents,—had been known, or could have been known, to Moses or his time; or, lastly, if—with the large view we would then necessarily take of the Deity—the actions, and feelings, and character attributed to Jehovah or the Elohim in the books of Moses any way accorded. No; if we must refuse to the God of Moses form or shape, if we will insist on the likeness of Adam to Him, being a likeness of the internal man: then let us make it a likeness of the internal man individually developed. For, though the Elohim then becomes an individual God, and though such a God no way comes

prescribed by God, i. e. when his internal individual self was changed, when he lost “the knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness” which were his intuitively, he lost “the moral image of God;” and, as individuals, we, too, have lost it. It was *the individual then*, and not *the man*, that bore God’s likeness.

³ Rather thus:—We know that

the descendants of Adam were men, but what the created father was, we cannot know; not having the same origin as, he may have been a being different in kind from, ourselves. And when, therefore, Moses tells us that Seth was born in his likeness, he intends but to assure us that he was neither more nor less than a man.

up to our even narrow views of the Deity, yet with such a God, much in the early history of the Jews that would be otherwise incomprehensible and absurd, becomes plain, simple, and intelligible.

Verse 8. De Guignes objects to the early annals of the Chinese, because they are so meagre; they contain little but names. What shall we say, then, to this genealogy of the Seth family, which compresses sixteen centuries and ten generations into thirty-two verses, and which enumerates and preserves the names of men, whose years serve,⁴ indeed, as links in the great chain of time—but who themselves are mere blanks unworthy of a record, and remembered only because they fulfilled the vulgarest laws of their species,—begat sons and daughters, and then died?

Verse 22. “And Enoch walked with (or before) God, and he was not, for God took him;” i. e. either translated him, that he should not see death; or took him to himself after an early, but religious and happy death.

Of these interpretations, the class of persons who accept *the first* will accept it,

1st. Because it is the most natural and the most common.

2ndly. Because it is backed by the authority of St. Paul; and,

3rdly. Because it presumes a miracle—to which last reason some will add this other,—and because the miracle it presumes was one familiar to the Jewish mind. Thus, according to the Jewish traditions, Elijah was carried up to heaven bodily, and was there supposed to tarry until he should be called again to earth to prepare the way for the Messiah.

Those, on the other hand, who prefer the *second interpretation*, will prefer it,

1st. Because it presumes *no* miracle; and they think it

⁴ Or rather to puzzle chronologists, for the different years given to the patriarchs in the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint versions alone, give to the world at the flood, an age varying from 1656, and 1307, to 2242 years.

⁵ Vide Hebrews xi. 4.

unwise to believe a single miracle more than is absolutely necessary.

2ndly. Because it proves that a future life was known to Moses and his times ; and,

3rdly. Because it but does that, without which no early record of ancient nations can be understood : i. e. it translates into matter of fact language the necessarily figurative expressions of an infant people.

Verse 29. "And he called his name Noah, saying, The same shall comfort us," &c. With the exception of this verse, the Deity, throughout this chapter, bears the name of Elohim. In this verse, however, he is styled Jehovah. And this verse, no way belying that taste for etymologies, we have already remarked in the *Jehovah*⁶ portions, of Genesis, contains the origin and etymology of the name of Noah or Noe, which it derives from *nachani* (to comfort), but which modern Hebraists seem to think more probably comes from *nach* or *nuach*,⁷ (to rest); an origin to which chap. viii. 21, (also a *Jehovah* verse), when it speaks of a savor of *rest*, (in our translation, "a sweet savor"), seems to allude.

If, now, we compare together the family registers contained in these two chapters, we are struck,

1st. By the similarity of the names which they each present to us. In *both* there is an Enoch, and in *both* a Lamech ; and, as the father of Lamech, we find in the *first* genealogy a Methusael, in the *second*, a Methuselah ; in *this*, too, we have a Cainan, a Mahalaleel, and a Jared ; and, in *that*, a Cain, a Mahajael, and an Irad. Down to Lamech, the common penultimate of both families,⁸ with the exception of the name of Seth, (a name unknown to the Cainites), the names, in *both* genealogies, bear so strong a resemblance

⁶ For brevity's sake, I will in future designate the several portions of the book of Genesis according to the name which they respectively give the Deity.

⁷ These etymologies are from Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary

on this verse—"De Noach dictum, consolabitur nos (jenachainence).—Bochart, Sac. Geog. vol iii, § 1.

⁸ I here look upon the Seth genealogy as terminated in Noah. Observe, also, that the names Seth and Cain have almost the same meaning.

to each other, at least in sound, as almost to raise and warrant a suspicion, that *the one* contains the descent of Noah, according to those who worshipped the Elohim; *the other*, his descent according to those who acknowledged Jehovah.

We observe, secondly, that, though in each of these genealogies the Deity has his own peculiar name, that, nevertheless, *in the one* genealogy, that of Jehovah, we find a stray⁹ verse in which he is called Elohim; and, *in the other*, that of Elohim, a similar one in which he is styled Jehovah; and each of these verses, we may remark by the way, connects the record to which it belongs with events which that record had omitted to mention. Thus *the verse Elohim*, in the *genealogy Jehovah*, alludes to the fate of Abel and the existence and banishment of Cain; while *the verse Jehovah*, in the *register Elohim*, reminds us of the curse which the Jehovah Elohim laid on the earth.

3rdly. That *both genealogies* simply state the descent from father to son—the *first* concisely, but not always in the same terms, thus:—"To Enoch was born," and "Irad, &c., begot," and "Cain and Lamech's wives bare;" *the second*, more at length, and with the exception of Enoch's "was not, for the Elohim took him," in the same formula invariably. Invariably it *first* notes the age of the father at the birth of the son: *then* the number of years which he lived after that event, and how during those years he begat more sons and daughters; and lastly, how he at length died, and at what age.

4thly. That *both*, up to the last generation of which they make mention, confine themselves, *the one* to the *notice*, *the other* to the *name*, of the eldest-born son. In that generation, however, *the former* records the names and deeds of the three sons, and the name of the daughter of Lamech; and *the latter*, the names of the three sons of Noah.¹

⁹ Chap. iv. 25. Eichorn thinks the Elohim of this verse to be the mistake of some copyist; for, first, it contains the etymology of the name Seth, and, in this case, it would be the only etymological *verse Elohim* before the time of Jacob; secondly, it is in the style of

the Jehovah etymologies. Compare chap. iv. 1-29 with the Elohim etymologies in Genesis lxxx.

¹ I have before viewed the genealogy as terminating in Noah. I do not, however, think myself precluded from extending it to his sons; i. e. from viewing it in several lights.

5thly. That *both* occasionally leave the barren office of the mere genealogist,—*the one*, to preserve the song of Lamech, and to chronicle the arts and inventions which illustrate the names of his sons; *the other*, to notice the piety of Enoch, and its high reward.

And, 6thly. That if we make the birth of Seth contemporaneous with that of Enoch, and then reckon the generations, *in the one* genealogy, from Cain, and, *in the other*, from Adam, we shall find that the sixth descent in both is the descent which most illustrates these families. In the sons of Lamech and in Enoch, *the agricultural or civic*, and *the pastoral or nomadic* races are, as it were, typified. For *these*, as they treasure up the names and customs of their ancestors—their common parents, as they live in the past, are of manners simple and primitive: and, as by the very nature of their occupations they are compelled to long solitude in the open heaven, are religious and contemplative in their characters; while *those*, as they are attached to the laws of their city—to their country, and its soil—are rather under the dominion of expediency, and more or less take the hue and colour of circumstances; and, as their habits oblige them to mix much one with the other, they acquire, by this very collision, understandings at once acute, inventive, and practical. Among agricultural people, then, civic duties; among nomads, family affections, predominate. And hence it is that the *first* genealogy dwells upon matters that are interesting to mankind, the *second*, on those which are purely personal; that *the one* records the piety of Enoch, and, because its generations were subject to no changes but those time brings with it, notices merely the ages of its patriarchs, and that *the other* hurriedly passes over all ignoble names, but seems to rejoice in the inventions for which the men of old were renowned; that *this* gives us an insight into the progress and state of antediluvian society, while *that* assists us to its chronological history, and that of the world.²

² The Arabians before Mahomet the study of chronology.—Vide almost wholly confined themselves Eichhorn, vol. iii, § 412, Einleitung, to the study of genealogies, with in A. T. which is almost necessarily united

CHAPTER VI.

THE DELUGE.—GENESIS vi, vii, viii.

Verses 1-12. These verses contain the determination of the Elohim, or Jehovah, to destroy man from the face of the earth, and the reasons which induced Him to that determination. These reasons are,

1st. The intermarriage of two different and distinct races: of the sons of God with the daughters of men.

2ndly. The unmitigated wickedness of man, in heart and thought—"for every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was evil continually;" and,

3rdly. His wickedness of conduct ;—"the earth was filled with violence."

As regards this determination itself, we may observe,

1st. That it presumes that the Deity rules the physical universe, not according to any general laws, but according as He may be pleased or displeased with man's conduct;¹ i. e. arbitrarily. And,

2ndly. That it shows us the Deity punishing wickedness by death; i. e. it shows us the Deity ruling the moral world by other laws than those to which it is now subject. For now *in individuals, physical crimes*, and only in so far as they are imprudences, are punished, and not invariably, by physical disease; while *moral enormities*, when they are enormities of the heart, when they do not affect the physical structure, when they confine themselves to evil thoughts and desires, or to malicious acts not punishable by law, and which injure only our neighbours, are inevitably accom-

¹ Supra, vide p. 32.

panied with troops of fears, suspicion, doubt of others, disappointment, and a moody discontent. The *crimes of masses, nations*, on the other hand, are avenged either by leagued enemies, or by the slower process of national degradation, or by intestine wars,—the terrible struggle of the oppressed classes with their oppressors for bread or liberty, or of the oppressors among themselves for solitary rule. Whether, then, we read the histories of nations, or observe the lives and fortunes of individuals, or attentively examine our own conduct, and the influence it has had upon our character and happiness: every where we see, notwithstanding the seeming exceptions that may rise to our lips, the even course of a great Providence, which, in the natural consequences of our actions, makes us to feel our errors, and thus urges us on to a closer study and a better observance of our duties. But what does *this book*? It holds up to us a Deity, who, indeed, intervenes in the affairs of men; but who intervenes to *punish* only, and not to *better* and *improve* mankind; and who, when he intervenes to punish, *punishes violently*, by changing the whole course of nature, and *unwisely* and *uselessly*,² by destroying the criminal, and not by rooting out or subduing the motives to crime.

As regards the reasons given for the determination, we may observe on the two last, that they do not altogether accord with the notions which, without them, we should be likely to form of antediluvian society from the genealogies. For, in the genealogies, we have seen *men*: living in cities, living, therefore, according to certain laws and institutions, and necessarily accustomed to some self-control, to repress the first impulses of passion and to restrain the merely animal instincts, and conscious, therefore, of some moral obligation, never mind how few its objects, or how narrow its range: *men*, pouring out in song to the wives of their heart their sorrows or their crimes: *men*, therefore, not in-

² “And the Lord smelled a sweet savour, and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake, for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth: neither will I again smite any more every thing living as I have done.”—Genesis. viii. 21.

sensible to domestic joys, not incapable of domestic affections: *men*, moreover, making rapid progress in the useful and pleasing arts, — attentive observers of nature and her works: *men* among whom thought is fermenting, and who live, therefore, in a certain security, and hold intellectual superiority in some respect. We have partly been shown, and partly guessed all this; we have every promise of an improving and healthy state of society: our hearts begin to beat with hope, — when all suddenly the sons of God appear upon the scene, and the earth is now filled with violence; the imagination of man's heart is evil continually; evil becomes man's good, his life. The Deity, therefore, decrees that man, irreclaimably wicked, shall perish. But of this great family, among all these renowned heroes that were of old, these benefactors of their age, a remnant will be found, a few at least, in whom dwells some love for all things great and good? No: no: — they must all perish, and one individual alone is chosen out as worthy to preserve our name and kind. Assuredly there is no keeping in this picture, no truth: or it had needed no deluge from God to destroy mankind; for whenever good shall have disappeared from the earth, Humanity will have committed suicide.

As now regards the first reason, we may remark, that though it is one the force of which we can scarcely be said to feel, it is one which would seem to have had no little weight with the nations of antiquity.³ For, in general, man, yet half barbarous, half civilized, has as slight a respect for himself as *man*, as he has a pampered conceit of himself as *the member of a certain tribe or nation*. In him the spirit of family overlays and smothers the spirit of Humanity. Self-pride and mutual contempt, we find, then, early separate nations not of the same blood; and diversity

³ And also half-civilized nations of modern times. Speaking of the Abyssinians, Gesenius informs us: "Bei Arabern heissen sie *Habasch*, das Land *Habascha*, d. i., ein aus mehreren Stämmen zusammenge-
laufener Haufe, weshalb sie auch selbst diesen Namen sich nicht

gern beilegen, in der Schrift-Sprache auch nicht brauchen, obgleich im gemeinen Leben Habesch vorkommt. Dagegen nennen sie selbst ihr Reich Gees oder Modra-Agasgan, Answanderung." — Ersch und Gruber Encyclop. art. *Æthiopien*.

of customs, laws, and religion, widen the breach. Not willingly do they hold intercourse with strangers, and they shudder away from any close alliance with them. Thus the Hindus avoid all foreigners, and the different castes of Hindus all commerce with each other:⁴ thus the Egyptian of ancient times drove the stranger from his coasts, and would not defile himself by marriage with a Greek:⁵ thus, too, the Persian could not intermarry with the Kharfester,⁶ nor the Jew with the Moabite:⁷ thus the Roman patrician feared to sully his nobility by a plebeian alliance:⁸ and the Peruvian Ynca to taint the purity of his blood by contracting a union with the member of any family other than his own.⁹

But Genesis represents the offspring of the mixed marriages it speaks of as giants, and as the cause of the wickedness and violence that prevailed. Similarly the Hindus hold in horror the children of parents of different castes; similarly, also, in the Boun-Dehesch, monsters with a tail, the men of the mountains, impious men, and black men, and the Arabs of the desert,¹ are the produce of Djemschid with a Dew,

⁴ Vide Dubois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. i, c. i; and compare pages 7 and 8 of Introduction to the *Toy-Cart*. in Wilson's *Hindoo Theatre*, vol. i, and Wachsmuth *Hist. Antiq. of Greece*, vol. i, p. 118.

⁵ "Οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸ τούτου (Ψαμμητιχόν) δυναστεύσαντες, ανεπιβαστον τοὺς ξένοις ἐποιοῦν τὴν Αἴγυπτον, τοὺς μὲν φονεῦντες, τοὺς δὲ καταδουλοῦμενοι τῶν καταπλεοντῶν." —Diod. Sic. lib. i, § 67; and Herod. lib. ii. c. xli: "Τῶν ἕνεκα οὐτ' ἀνὴρ Αἰγύπτιος, οὔτε γυνή, ἀνδρὰ Ἑλλήνα φιλήσειε ἀν τῷ στοματι."

⁶ I remember no law in the Zend which prohibits marriage with Kharfesters; but the whole tenor of the books supposes such a law.

⁷ Vide Ezra ix. 1, 2.

⁸ "De connubio patrum et plebis C. Canuleius tribunus plebis rogationem promulgavit; qua contaminari sanguinem suum patres confundique jura gentium re-

bantur."—Livius, lib. iv, § i; also lib. iv, 2; vi, 41; vii, 6; "Augustus magni existimavit, sincerum, atque ob omni colluvione peregrini ac servilis sanguinis incorruptum servare populum."—Suetonius, ad August. § 40.

⁹ Of the first Ynca, Garcilasso de la Vega says: "Il avoit eu encore de cette princesse d'autres fils et filles, qui furent mariés ensemble pour ne s'allier qu'avec ceux de leur sang. D'ailleurs ces mariages de frères et sœurs avoient été ordonnés par l'Ynca Manco Capac de la part du soleil; de sorte que leurs fils ne pouvoient se marier autrement, pour conserver leur sang pur et entier, ni l'Ynca héritier du royaume épouser autre personne que sa sœur."—Histoire des Yncas, vol. i, p. 53.

¹ "Ils s'unirent ensemble, et de leur union vint l'inférieur, l'impie, le noir de peau, les Arabes du dé-

the sister of a Dew; and similarly among the Greeks, the children of a citizen by any woman not a citizen, were dis-
pised and regarded as illegitimate.² In general, wherever the marriage is unholy, the offspring of that marriage will be considered unholy also.³ The children will share in the hate with which their parents are visited, and will almost necessarily grow up with all those vices which seem to cling to the degraded classes as an heirloom. With their names will be associated all crimes and violence; and to sweep them away from the face of the earth will be regarded as a just and holy deed, and one beneficial to mankind and pleasing to the gods.

Verse 2. "And the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair."

Now, because the more immediate servants of God, the

sert."—Zend, vol. ii, p. 379. From the silence of the Zend books on this criminal union between the Holy Djemschid and the Dews, Rhode regards it as a tradition of later times, and a proof that oft repeated oral traditions at length mixed themselves up with the Zend myths.—Heil. Sage, p. 49.

² "Athenian citizenship depended essentially on being born in wedlock, of parents who were themselves citizens. The offspring of a citizen and a foreign woman were, in the eye of the law, illegitimate, *νοθοι*."—Herman, *Pol. Antiq. of Greece*, § 110; and see *Life of Themistocles*, Plutarch. In Lacedemon also we find Cleombrotus named successor to Agesilaus, in preference to Leonidas, who is refused the crown because he had married a foreigner. Vide Tittman's *Verfassung Griechenlands*, lib. iii. p. 95. Even the philosophical Plato in this respect rises not above the prejudices of his age. In his work *De Legibus*, lib. ix, speaking of the produce of slaves with citizens: "Εαν δ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ δου-

λης, ἡ ἐκ δούλου ἐαυτῆς, καὶ περιφανες τοῦτ' ᾗ, το μὲν τῆς γυναικος αἱ γυναῖκες εἰς ἀλλήν χωρὰν ἐκπέποντων συν τῷ πατρὶ το δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρος οἱ νομοφυλάκες, συν τῇ γεννησασθ."—"Quod si quispiam ex serva sua natum susceperit, aut quæpiam ex servo peperit proprio; idque pateat, natum quidem *ex serva et libero* mulieres in aliam regionem cum patre simul emittant; natum vero *ex libera et servo* legum custodes una cum matre extra fines expellant." Should we not read the first part: "natum *ex servo et libera* mulieres"—the second: "natum vero *ex libero et serva* legum custodes," &c.?

³ Thus Menu tells us that "in the four base marriages (by purchase, for lust, by ravishment, by treachery) are produced sons acting cruelly, speaking falsely, abhorring the Vedas and the duties prescribed in it. From the blameless nuptial rites of men springs a blameless progeny; from the reprehensible, a reprehensible offspring."—*Institutes*, c. iii. v. 41, 42.

angels that wait around the throne of the Almighty, are spiritual beings; and because in heaven, i. e. for the inhabitants of heaven, there is neither marriage nor giving in marriage,—i. e. because fleshly pleasures are incompatible with purely spiritual natures—therefore, by “the sons of God,” argue Christian commentators, cannot be intended the angels of God. But who then? *One party*⁴ observing that in the Old Testament the Israelites are sometimes styled the children of the Lord, and the Moabites the people of Chemosh, and strange women the daughters of a strange God,⁵ conclude that “the sons of God” is but a figurative expression for the worshippers of God, the Sethites, who are thus placed in opposition to those who worshipped no God whatever,⁶ (“the daughters of men”), the descendants of Cain. *Another party*,⁷ however, looking to the genius and idiom of the Hebrew language, find that a great rushing wind is called a wind of God; a lofty mountain, a mountain of God; kings, and mighty men, sons of God. They pretend,⁸ moreover, that the words which our version renders “sons of God,” may be translated sons of dignities, and that the passage then means, that the antedi-

⁴ Michaelis, Anmerk. zum erst Buch Mose, vi. 2; Adam Clarke's Comment. ad h. l.

⁵ Deut. xiv. 1; Numb. xxi. 29; Malachi, ii. 11.

⁶ Only in Michaelis, who very properly applies the same method of interpretation to explain the two parallel phrases, “daughters of men,” and “sons of God.” The first being so called, because they recognised none but a natural father; while the others obtained their name, because they claimed God as their creator. But one may ask, how was it then, that in the *names of the family of Cain*, the name of God, the Elohim, so often enters, as e. g. in Mehujael, in Methusael. Compare Gesenius Com. üb. den Jesiah, v. i. p. 281.

⁷ Patrick on this verse; Eichhorn, and the Rationalists gene-

rally. And again: “Auch die Könige eben Götter-Söhne waren.”—Gesenius, id. in Cap. ix. 5, vol. i, p. 362; and see Exodus xxii. 28. In Homer, too, we find that kings and heroes are ever “sons of the gods—nourished by the gods,” Διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς—διοτρεφέντων βασιλῶν, &c., and in the Chou-king, the emperor is “Fils du Ciel.”—Part iii, c. viii, p. 122, &c.

⁸ I have united the views of several commentators. This translation is from the Exposit. Index to Holy Bible, by the editor of Calmet, on c. vi, v. 2, who adds: “This view of the passage is not new: Onkelos and the Targums read, *the sons of the great*; the Sam. reads, *the sons of sultans*; Arab, *sons of the nobles*; but it takes off entirely the notion of angelic commerce with women.”

luvian chiefs and nobles took wives of all the handsome inferior women that they chose.

To these interpretations we may object:—

1st. That they are founded on the conjectural notions which are, at present, entertained with respect to angelic natures, and that they would, therefore, fall to the ground with those notions. In other words, we object to them as interpretations made for the nonce,⁹ because they are not such as would be suggested by an unbiassed perusal of the passage itself.

2ndly. Because they either no way account for the giants, and the mighty men of old (the men of renown, said to have been the produce of these mixed marriages); or they account for them irrationally, by supposing that a superior race, physically and mentally superior, was obtained, by grafting a pure or noble on an impure or inferior stock.

To the *first interpretation* we may besides object,

1st. That, though the Israelites are, indeed, sometimes the children, they are never the sons of God;¹ and that, though they are His children, they are His children only in opposition to other people or persons, the worshippers of other gods: but never His children, as in this passage, in opposition to the rest of mankind. In a word, they are His children, because He is their national God, and *not because* they are especially his servants.

2ndly. That if the Sethites were intended by “the sons of God,” and the Cainites by “the daughters of men,” that, then, the terms used to express the two families, would have been more general (*children*, most probably), as inter-marriages would have taken place between daughters and sons, as well as between sons and daughters. And,

⁹ See, however, the last note in favour of the second interpretation.

¹ In Hosea only is the expression applied to the servants of God. The verse is this: “Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which

cannot be measured nor numbered. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them *Ye are the sons of the living God.*”—c. i, 10.

3rdly. We may object the context:—for, “the daughters of men” must be the daughters of the men in the first verse, who then began to multiply on the earth: and these men, again, can be no other than the several members of those families, whose genealogies have but now been given (the men the descendants of Cain, and the men the descendants of Seth), and they are the men to whom the sons of God are placed in direct opposition.

To the *second interpretation* we may object,

1st. That though it may rest on oriental idioms, it is scarcely conformable to what we know of oriental customs and modes of thought. In the East, the chief men honour the poor by choosing wives from among them; in the East polygamy is permitted, and even honoured as the privilege of wealth and station. Moreover, as we know that it was sanctioned by the example² of the patriarchs, we can scarcely suppose that it was a crime in the opinion of the author of Genesis;—and yet a great crime he evidently thought it, that the sons of God should take to themselves wives of the daughters of men.

2ndly. We may object the context:—for, if this interpretation were the true one, the violence which filled the earth would surely have been shown us as a consequence of the selfish lust of the rich and powerful; whereas, it seems more especially connected with the mention of the children of the mixed marriages. *They*, it is, who are the men of renown, and whose wickedness is great: *in them* vice is inherent—the type and characteristic of their race; and *them* the deluge is sent to destroy.

But who, then, are these “sons of God”? I will not assert, with “some of the ancients,” and with Philo and St. Austin, that they were positively *οἱ ἀγγελοι του θεου*,³ but I am inclined to think that they were beings of another race and kind than the sons of Cain and Seth. This interpretation, though there are objections to it, I prefer.

1st. For its simplicity. It does not speculate on any

² Selden, De Jure Naturali, lib. v, c. vi.

³ Patrick, Comment on Genesis, ad hunc loc.

foregone conclusions: it understands the words in their most obvious sense, and that a sense in which they are undoubtedly used in other parts of Scripture.⁴

2ndly. For its antiquity. In the apocryphal book of Enoch, supposed to have been written about a century before Christ, these "sons of God" are expressly stated to have been angels, inhabitants of heaven; and to them, as angels, does not that inexplicable verse in the 1 Corinthians⁵ refer?

3rdly. Because it accords well with the notions and views of ancient nations. Thus the Greek mythology delights in the loves of gods and women, and men and goddesses: and the Hindu in the marriages of nymphs and heroes;⁶ while the Persian notes, though with abhorrence, the connexion of Djemschid with a Dew, the sister of a Dew.⁷ I know no infant people among whom the supposition of a sexual intercourse between the higher natures of heaven and the inhabitants of the earth is either impossible or absurd.

4thly. Because it can, alone, make the deluge justifiable. In the Mosaic cosmogony, God creates man, and the earth for man's use and pleasure. Angels, being of another kind, however, intermarry with men, and from their union springs a mixed and monstrous race—a race only half-man,⁸ but more powerful than man, and oppressing and destroying him;⁹ a race essentially wicked, whose evil nature no time can change, no circumstances ameliorate; a race whose very existence counteracts the designs and counsels of the Deity; and one which, in order that mankind may again replenish the earth, God resolves to destroy,

⁴ Job xxxviii. 7: "When the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy."

⁵ Chap. vii. 10. The reference is rather to a passage in the book of Enoch: "For in the great day they shall be judged; and their wives also shall be judged, *who led astray the angels of heaven that they might*

salute them."—Enoch xix. 2, with which compare 1 Corinthians xi. 10.

⁶ Vide Introduction to "The Hero and the Nymph," Wilson's Hindoo Theatre, vol. i.

⁷ Vide note 1, p. 165, supra.

⁸ The Book of Enoch takes the same view of them, vide chap. xv. 8.

⁹ Ibid. vii. 11, 12, &c.; and x.

while yet one man of pure blood and perfect in his generations exists.¹

To this interpretation, however, it may be objected,

1st. That it is contrary to any rational conception of spirits or angels. This objection, which can have no weight with him who reads this book to understand its meaning, will be a fatal one in the eyes of all who read it to find there doctrines of faith and inspired truths.

2ndly. That it supposes beings,—angels, for instance,—which seem strange to the cosmogony of Moses.² Such beings have however already appeared in the persons of the cherubim, and will often again appear in the course of the narrative. But whether they are of Hebrew, whether of Chaldaic origin,—whether they belong to some popular and ancient superstition, the traces³ of which are not unfrequently to be met with in the works of Moses; or whether they are to be ranked among the interpolations introduced into the Jewish books at their great revision after the captivity, are questions which it is impossible, at this distance of time, to solve. For us it must suffice that we find the angels *here*, and their appearance it is our business to reconcile, as nearly as we may, with the rest of the story. And,

3rdly. We may object the context:—for, if the terms used to express the wickedness of the earth's antediluvian inhabitants were applicable only to the mixed and monstrous races, would Jehovah have characterized, in pre-

¹ I reason here as, I presume, Moses, and the men of Moses' time, the men whom Moses addressed, would have reasoned. Thus Menu, speaking of the mixed classes, says, "In whatever country such men are born as destroy the purity of the four (Hindu) classes, that country soon perishes, together with the natives of it."—Laws of Menu, x. 61.

² No angel is mentioned by name till after the captivity, and the Jews

generally acknowledge that they brought their names from Babylon. That their existence and creation puzzled commentators, may be seen from Hyde, *De Rel. Pers.* lib. iii; and Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, lib. iv, c. ix; and see note 4, p. 113.

³ To such a superstition may be referred the offering which Abraham made of his son; to such also the Theraphim of Rachel, &c.; and compare Hosea iii. 4 with Judges xvii. 4, 5.

cisely the same terms,⁴ that purer race which Noah and his sons were to propagate over the earth?

“There were giants in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men.” Giants, Nephilim. Our commentators, as usual, anxious to square and fashion the sacred books on the Procrustean bed of reigning opinion, have made these *Nephilim* mere men of violence, *επιπιπτοντες, βιαιοι*,⁵ men renowned for their strength and wickedness. I must own, however, that I see no reason for rejecting the common and vulgar translation, for,

1st. I find that giants play no ignoble part in the mythology or traditions of infant nations. In Greece,⁶ of a mixed race, they unite against, and almost overcome, the powers of heaven. In India: *enemies of the Brahmins*, they lie in wait to spoil and pollute, and thus render of none effect, the holiest sacrifices; and, *enemies of the gods*, they wage with them doubtful war,—the very persons of the holy Trimurti tremble before them, and Siva himself but escapes from their hands, through the stratagem of Vishnu.⁷ In China, after a long line of beneficent monsters, we arrive at Tchi-yeou, the inventor of arms of iron, and of of

⁴ Compare chap. vii. 5: “And God saw that.....every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually,” with viii. 21: “And the Lord said, I will not again curse the ground for man’s sake: for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth.”

⁵ Aquila and Symmachus, from Patrick, ad loc.; and Il Stuoire del Padre Menochio, vol. iii, p. 660; and with these translations compare the Egyptian many-bodied men, *τους ὑπο των Ἑλληνων ονομαζομενους Γιγαντας....ενιοι μεν ουν αυτους γηγενεις φασιν ὑπαρξαι....ενιοι δε λεγουσι, σωματος ῥωμη διενεγκοντας, και πολλας πραξεις επιτελεσαμενους, απο του συμβεβη-*

κοτος μυθολογηθηναι πολυσωματος. —Diod. Sic. lib. i, c. xxvi.

⁶ According to Orpheus: ‘*Ουνεκα γης εγενοντο και αιματος ουρανοιο.*

⁷ Vide Du Bois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. ii, part ii, c. xxxii; also the account of the churning of the Amreeta, in notes to Wilkins’ *Bhagavat-Ghita*, p. 148. In both the Hindu and Greek mythologies the giants act the same parts; in both they war against Heaven, and in both, with a like result—at first partial success, and, in the end, complete overthrow. They are known as Asuras, Daityas, Danavas, and Rakshasas in India. Vide *Introd. to “Uttara Rama Christa,”* Wilson’s *Hindoo Theatre*, vol. i, p. 278.

torments, the first rebel, the first instructor in crime, the elder brother and the chief of the nine black giants, with whom, aided by legions of evil spirits, he, for three years, bids defiance to the power of the virtuous Hoang-ti: though he is at last defeated by the special interposition of heaven.⁸ Among the northern nations, too, we hear of giants; but, there, they are not necessarily the enemies of gods and men: if at times they show themselves as wanton and cruel oppressors, at others they are held up to our admiration as having earned the right to a deathless fame by great and noble deeds.⁹ In the New World also giants were not unknown: traditions, though silent on their moral qualities, tell us of their existence, and dwell on their enormous stature, for which, fragments of bones here and there discovered, are adduced as credible vouchers.¹

2ndly. Because I find the existence of giants recognized in other parts of Scripture. In Deuteronomy (chap. ii. 10)

⁸ "Le Chou-king dit.....que Tchi-yeou est le premier de tous les rebelles, et que sa rebellion répandit sur tous les peuples, qui apprirent de lui à commettre toutes sortes de crimes.....Tchi-yeou étoit chef de neuf noirs.....on dit de même que les géants étoient frères.....Ils avoient le corps d'animaux, la tête de cuivre, et le front de fer; c'est aux neuf noirs, et à Tchi-yeou leur aîné et leur chef, qu'on attribue l'origine des révoltes et des fraudes.....Tchi-yeou se mit à la tête des mauvais génies.....Le roi de Hi-ong, pendant trois années, livra neuf batailles sans pouvoir vaincre l'ennemi.....alors le ciel lui envoya une fille céleste, qui lui donna des armes, avec l'assurance de la victoire."—Chou-king, Dis. Prél. p. 128.

⁹ An instance of the latter is the celebrated Starcheter (vide Hist. de Gent. Septentri, Olao Magno auctore, lib. v, c. iv.); an instance of the former is the terrible Fafnir, who fell by the sword of Sigurd. Vide Volsunga-Saga, chap. xxvii,

Nordischen Helden, v. iv, by Von der Hagen. In the Edda the giant Yme "war gottlos wie alle seine Nachkommen." Edda Zwote Fabel, p. 114, Schimmelman.

¹ Cieca de Leon, quoted by Garcilasso de la Vega, lib. ix, c. ix, relates a tradition (common among the natives of Munta) of giants, who in former times landed on their shores and infested them: he adds that large bones have been found, which confirm the tradition. Waffer (Hist. Gén. des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 459, ed. Hol.) says: "C'est une tradition du pays qu'il y avoit autrefois des géans aux environs de Mexico. J'y ai vu, sous le gouvernement du Duc d'Albuquerque, des ossemens et des dents d'une prodigieuse grandeur, entre autres, une dent de trois doigts de large, et longue de quatre. Les plus habiles gens du pays jugèrent que la tête ne devoit pas avoir moins d'une aune de largeur." And see also Purchas his Pilgrimage, lib. ix, c. ix, p. 723.

we hear of the Emims, who are tall as the Anakim, "which also were accounted giants;" and these Anakim are themselves described by the spies as men before whom the children of Israel were "as grasshoppers," as men "of great stature,"² and of a stature which seems to have borne the same proportion to that of common mortals, that their grapes bore to common grapes.³

But it may be objected that all this is very indefinite. What shall we say, then, when we find the length and breadth of the bedstead of him "who only remained of the remnant of the giants?"⁴—nine cubits, somewhat more than fifteen feet, was the length, and four cubits, about seven feet, the breadth thereof." Now, surely, the great size of this bedstead⁵ has been especially noted, to give us some conception of the great stature of the man; but this bedstead, while it measures the individual, measures him as one, the last, of a certain race; and it thus enables us to form some probable guess as to the size of that race;⁶ a size which, however great the allowances we may make for the nature of the admeasurement, quite warrants the title of giant.

"There were giants in those days." Moses, without giving us any clue to the ordinary stature of men in the early ages of the world, merely states that, in those times,

² Numbers xiii. 33.

³ "They cut from thence a *branch with one cluster of grapes*, and they bare it between two upon a staff." —Id. ver. 23.

⁴ Deuteronomy iii. 11.

⁵ The English editor of Calmet, in Fragment xii, thinks that *oresh*, rendered "bedstead," properly intends the floor or carpet of the duan, or perhaps both. "Either sense of the word," he adds, "will take off much occasion from the wonderment of ignorance on the dimensions of this bedstead or duan." But if this interpretation

be the correct one, what possible object could Moses have in thus particularizing the size and material of this bed of Og? See Fragment xiii, id. Surely its size is given to mark the size of the man, and its material to show his hardihood.

⁶ I have said, "*probable guess*," and yet in the eyes of those who weigh well the prejudices of the old world: who remember that with them man was a being ever degenerating both physically and morally, Og, the last of the giants, will be a pigmy compared with his fathers.

there existed a race of giants, i. e. of men whose stature far exceeded that of their cotemporaries. Adam, and Seth born in the image of Adam, may then have been either of our stature, or tall as the Rabbins love to represent them.⁷ Whatever was their size, the giants were giants, *quoad* them. The question, then, which we have to settle, is, not whether man was ever twenty feet in height (in which case we might appeal to the mummies and sarcophagi of Egypt, and through them show that man, four thousand years ago, was physically very like man of the present day, and that probably, therefore, the existing races in the same countries have always averaged the same height), but whether, with and among the race of men, there has ever existed another race—now extinct—the race of giants. In favour of its existence,

I. We have the independent testimony of several nations no way connected together. China and Greece, Mexico and Peru—the old and the new world—have their giants. To this testimony, however, it may justly be objected, that it is purely traditional, and of so mythological a character, that, unless corroborated by other evidence, it can form no rational ground for belief in any fact.

II. We have certain fossil remains spoken of by ancient writers as the bones of men of gigantic stature. Thus Pausanias,⁸ on hearsay, relates, that on occasion of an inundation in Mysia, human bones were thrown up of an enormous size. Boccaccio, in his *Genealogia Deorum*, informs us that, in his own time, a number of peasants, while employed on some excavations near Trapani, in Sicily, discovered a large cave, in which they found the body of a giant, seated, with the left hand leaning on a staff. On being exposed to the air, the body crumbled into dust; but

⁷ “Moise Barufas dice, che quando Adamo fu scacciato dal Paradiso terrestre, passò il mare à guazzo, tanto era grande, e si trasferè ad altri paese.”—Il Stuore del Padre Menochio, vol. i, p. 29. All these fabulous and exaggerated tales, the sacred books, however,

discountenance. In the account of the deluge we find that the waters prevailed fifteen cubits (about 23 feet); we may presume therefore that the stature of the tallest man of that time was below that height.

⁸ Vide Il Stuore, ut supra, vol. iii, p. 661.

the staff was preserved, and weighed fifteen hundred pounds. Girolamo Maggio,⁹ in the first book of his *Miscellanies*, affirms, that while he was a prisoner in Africa, he saw the head of a giant, which had been ploughed up by two Spanish slaves, who, in the hope of obtaining their liberty, presented it to Assano, the son of Barbarossa. This head measured, he says, eleven palms in circumference. Maggio adds, that a friend of his, a certain *abbate*, in digging a well near Reggio, found a human skeleton five brachia in length. On these fossil remains, we will observe,

1st. That, with the exception of those mentioned by Pausanias, they were the remains, and only *the partial remains*, of single individuals; and that they do not seem to have been ever examined with any attention, but to have been at once received as the skeletons of men. And,

2ndly. That as no human fossil remains have been discovered since comparative anatomy has become a science, we must receive with caution all conclusions drawn by former times from some enormous tooth or thigh-bone;¹ and with *the more caution*, as all such bones have, when submitted to scientific examination, been found to be the bones, not of men, but of some of those great primitive monsters who were the earth's first inhabitants.²

⁹ As, unlike the others, who tell what they have heard merely, Maggio relates what he actually saw. I will transcribe the passage from Menochio: "Maggio ritrovandosi l'anno 1559 prigioniero in Africa, vidde la testa d'un gigante, che due Spagnuoli schiavi con l'aratro a caso havevano trovata, e dissotterata e portata con concorse di molta gente tratta della novita della cosa ad Assano figlio di Barbarossa, con speranza d'ottenere con questo curioso presente, la liberta; ma che quel' barbaro non gliela volle concedere, e solamente face dar lore cinque Unghari, e che quella testa haveva di circonferenza undici palmi, e che quelli schiavi Spagnuoli riferivano che nel luogo dove have-

vano trovato quel cranio, erano anco le altre osse di quel corpo, di grandezza à quella testa corrispondente."—Id. vol. iii, p. 661.

¹ Vide note 1, p. 173: "Sancte Agostino nel lib. 15 de Civit. Dei, al cap.9, dice d'haver visto un dente d'huomo di tal grossezza, che diviso in parti haverebbe potuto far cento dei nostri."—Menochio, Ib. vol. i, p. 29. "I saw a tooth (saith Acosta) at Mexico, in the year 1586, as big as the fist of a man, and according to this all the rest was proportionable."—Purchas his Pilgrimage, lib. viii, c. x, p. 660.

² Suetonius seems to have been aware of this: of the bones collected by Augustus at Caprea, he tells us that they were "immanium bellua-

And III. We have a few historical giants. Thus Pliny mentions one Gabara, in the reign of Claudius, who measured above nine feet. The emperor Maximus was upwards of eight feet high. The standard-bearer of Charles V. was celebrated for his gigantic stature. But why multiply instances? We have seen in our own time O'Brien, the Irish, and Behin, the Belgian, giant,—men some three feet above the ordinary height. But these historical giants are pigmies compared with the giants of mythology, or even with the Og of Moses. They are moreover few, and only prove, that we do not justly rate the maximum of human stature, and not that nature has ever produced a finer and nobler race, to be pressed from the earth by a weaker and more ignoble one. Without, therefore, altogether denying the possibility of a race of giants, we must allow that we have no evidence for, and great probabilities against, such a race having ever existed.

“The same became mighty men of old, men of renown.” Such, and of a like origin, were, in Hindu story, Rama, Sumitra, &c.; such, among the Peruvians, Manco Capac, and Mama Oello Huaco; and such, in Grecian mythology, Hercules, Pollux, Æneas, &c., and in later times, and with another fame, the divine Plato. But *these* were all honoured as heroes and demi-gods, and were men of renown—because they destroyed monsters and repressed violence—because they were kind, benevolent, pious, gentle; while *those*, if we may judge by the context, must have earned infamy, by doing violence, by oppressing and enslaving their fellows, and by lives stained with all deeds of lust and rapacity.

Verse 3. The Lord declares that his patience is nearly exhausted, and that he will allow the race then inhabiting the earth only one hundred and twenty years more of life. Such is the determination which this verse makes known to us. The reason, however, which it gives for that determination, “my spirit shall not always strive with man,

rum ferarumque membra prægran- et arma Heroum.” (Vide Suet. Au-
dia, quæ dicuntur gigantum ossa gustus, § 73.

for that *he also is flesh*," I do not understand. For to suppose that *flesh* is a metaphorical expression for carnally-minded,³ seems to me scarcely in character with these early times; and to give it the meaning of *mortal*, or by it to intend that "*natural weakness flesh is heir to*,"⁴ is to make Jehovah conclude on man's destruction for reasons which should most especially induce him to mercy and long-suffering.⁵

Again, "for that *he also is flesh*." What is the force of the particle *also*? Does it imply that man was something more than flesh, that he was also spirit? Or is it merely used to give force to the sentence?

Verse 7. "And the Lord said, I will destroy man, both man and beast, and the creeping thing, &c."

The Hebrews—who, like other ancient nations, regarded every unaccountable occurrence or every unexpected commotion of the elements as some especial manifestation of God's will, and, when it affected mankind, as the instrument by means of which God rewarded his favourites or punished his enemies—observed moreover, that whenever man suffered, whether by earthquake or by fire from heaven, the inferior creation suffered with him. With man, therefore, they seem to have associated all living creatures as man's servants; and, as his servants, they have made them to share in his crimes and his misfortunes, and to partake in his blessings and prosperity.⁶ Thus his animal companions were driven with him from Paradise, and with him they now perish in the deluge. And thus, too, in after times, we find that with their masters they too are doomed,⁷ and must die by the sword or be burned with

³ In Patrick, Clarke, in h. l.

⁴ Vide Michaelis, in h. l. The translations of Michaelis and De Wette I will subjoin. Michaelis: "Mein Geist soll die Menschen nicht immerfort strafen, wenn sie irren. Der Mensch ist Fleisch," &c. De Wette: "Mein Geist soll nicht im Menschen bleiben ewiglich, sintemal er Fleisch ist," &c.

⁵ Vide Psalm lxxvii, 9. Where these reasons do so induce him.

⁶ Thus in Burma—"Some of their doctors assert that domestic animals follow the fortunes of mankind, and that where men live long they do so likewise."—Lit. of the Burmese by Buchanan, vol. vi. p. 215. Asiatic Researches.

⁷ Vide Deut. xiii. 15, 16; vide

fire: and that with them they too must fast and cease from labour: and that with them they are blessed⁸ and made fruitful and free from sickness.

Verse 9. "These are the generations of Noah." Eichhorn observes on these words, "these are the generations," that they occur only where there is a pause in the story, and when the author is about to pass on to another subject. They evince in the present case,—the transition from the antediluvian to the actually existing world; used again in chap. xi. 29, ("these are the generations of Terah")—the transition from the history of mankind to that of the family of Abraham; and again in chap. xxv. 19, ("these are the generations of Isaac")—the transition of the narrative from the life of Abraham to that of Isaac.

Verses 13-16. I have diligently read several commentaries on the plan, &c. of this ark, and though they are all no doubt very ingenious, I am, I must own, as much in the dark as ever.

The Elohim gives Noah instructions to build an ark, and instructions which pretty clearly show that Noah knew nothing of ship-building:⁹ and yet follow these instructions to the letter—build the vessel to order, and then load it as this ark was loaded, and it would not, and could not, float;¹⁰

also the destruction of Amalek, 1 Sam. xv. 3; of Jericho, Joshua vi.; and the judgment passed upon Achan, because he had taken of the accursed thing. "He and his sons, his daughters, and his oxen, and his sheep, and his asses, and his tent, and all that he had, are stoned with stones, and burnt with fire after they have been stoned with stones." (Joshua viii.)

⁸ Vide Commandments; Jonah iii. 7; Levit. xxv. 18, &c.; Exodus xxiii. 25, 26; Deut. vii. 14; xxviii. 4, &c.

⁹ "Hier scheint es Noach werde als ein der Schiffs-bau-kunst völlig unwissender unterrichtet." — Mi-

chaelis, Comment. ad h. l. And the author of *Nimrod*—who somewhat ingeniously argues that the waters which were collected into seas were placed under the earth, (he endeavours to explain away the great whales, &c.)—also observes: "that the instructions given by God to Noah do not allude to the previous existence of any such art as navigation.—Vol. iv, p. 120.

¹⁰ In his *Orient. Bib.* vol. xviii, p. 27, Michaelis, however, mentions that the Dutch, during the peace of 1609, built vessels on the model of the ark, and found that they carried a third more than common ships of the same size. "Im 1609 lebte zu

unless, indeed, you built it on a raft. But, however, let the ark be built—let it float—how then do you provide light and air for the crowds within the cells of its several stories? How do you cleanse off the impurities of this, in one short week, Augean stable? And how with a crew of eight persons only do you manage daily to supply so many animals, all so different in their habits, with their just proportions of wholesome food? Assuredly, when we consider the skill which the *mere* construction of such a vessel as the ark supposes, and the experience and method, knowledge and science which were required to fit it for the purposes for which it was intended, we cannot but feel that these instructions, which dwell so minutely on a certain length, and breadth, and height, on a one window,¹ and a one door, are but as the meagre ideas of a prince, from which an architect has to build a palace.

Verses 18-22. Michaelis² is of opinion, that during the one hundred and twenty years of warning, Noah was employed in collecting together the birds and beasts which were to be preserved from the deluge, and in observing their habits, diet, &c. But how, we may then ask, could Noah, without an especial revelation, have ascertained that his collection of animals was a complete one? And how could he, without a knowledge of natural history (scarcely possible in these early times), have avoided overcharging it with

Hoorn im Nordholland, ein Menoniste, Peter Janson, der auf den Einfall kam ein Schiff nach eben der Proportion bauen zu lassen die Moses angiebt, nur nach verjungtem Maassstabe, 120 Fuss lang, 20 breits, und 12 hoch. Bey dem Bau lachte ihm jedermann aus, aber er bestand auf seinem Sinn; als es in See kam, fand sich dass es ein Drittheil mehr Last tragen konnte als andere Schiffe von gleichen Grösse, *nicht mehr Hände zum regieren brauchte, und viel geschwinder seegelte!!* Die Folge

war, dass die Holländer viel solcher Schiffe baneten, die sie *Archen Noa* nenneten, nur mit dem Ende des Stillstandes 1621 hörten sie auf, weil sie keine Canonen tragen konnten, also gegen Kapern nicht sicher waren." Will our ship-builders take counsel from Peter Janson's successful experiment?

¹ "A window shalt thou make in the ark." (v. 16). "And it came to pass.....that Noah opened the window." (ix. 6).

² Michaelis, Comment. on Gen. vi. 18-22, ad h. l.

specimens of varieties of the same species of animal?³ Is it not, then, more natural, more in accordance with the spirit of the myth, to suppose that all these animals of their own accord presented themselves to Noah, and of their own accord came into the ark?

Chapter vii. verses 2, 3. “Of every clean beast shalt thou take to thee by sevens.”

Dr. Adam Clarke⁴ observes, that under “clean beasts” are included all beasts fit for food and sacrifice. If, however, we examine the laws relating to clean and unclean beasts, and compare them with those relating to animals to be offered in sacrifice;⁵ we find that, though *all clean beasts* are beasts fit for food, not *all* are fit for sacrifice; and also, that *of those* which are fit for sacrifice, *some*, for particular sacrifices, are required to be of a certain age; and *all*, at all times, must be perfect and without blemish. As, then, we have no reason to suppose that these intricacies of the Jewish law were known to Noah and his times, we will, with Michaelis,⁶ by the expression “clean beasts” understand merely beasts proper for food.

But if “clean beasts” be beasts proper for food, then the antediluvian men were accustomed not merely to eat flesh, but to restrict themselves to the flesh of certain animals only, and to look on all other flesh with disgust, and with a certain religious antipathy. And yet, after the deluge, we find the Elohim, and for the first time, giving man permission to eat, and without any distinction of meats, “of every moving thing that liveth.” Surely the terms “clean” and “unclean,” as applied in this passage to the brute creation, have all the appearance of anachronisms.

“Clean and unclean beasts.” From Leviticus xi. we

³ All the calculations made as to the capacity of the ark to contain the animals for which it was intended are made on the number of species known exclusive of the varieties. (Vide Bishop Williams on this subject in Dr. Adam Clarke's

Commentary on verse 15 of this chapter.

⁴ Commentary, ad h. l.

⁵ Compare Leviticus xi. with Leviticus i. ii. &c.

⁶ Commentary, ad. h. l.

learn, that *of beasts all* which part the hoof and are cloven footed, and chew the cud, are clean—all others, unclean; and *of fish, all* with fins and scales may be eaten, while all without them are an abomination. Of birds and insects this chapter, moreover, furnishes us with a list in the *one case* of the non-edible, in *the other* of the edible, kinds. It appears, then,

1st. That the marks which distinguish *clean* from *unclean* animals were simple and decisive, and admitted of no exceptions; and,

2ndly. That although unclean animals seem while yet alive no way to have polluted those with whom they came in contact, yet that as carcasses they were always unclean.

The same superstitious regard for meat we find,

1. Among the Hindus. The Bramin, *of our day*,⁷ not only abstains from all animal food, and restricts himself to a milk and vegetable diet; but he also puts an anathema⁸ on certain vegetables and preparations of milk which other nations find pleasant to the taste, and no way prejudicial to the health. He will not, for instance, “eat of garlic, onions, leeks, or mushrooms, nor any vegetable raised in dung,”⁹ or the head or root of which is round.¹ He avoids, also, “red gums, and the juices of wounded stems, and rice boiled with furmity.” Of milks he must not taste

⁷ “The use of flesh-meat is positively enjoined at certain obsequies, &c.; but the precepts of their lawgivers on the subject are by some deemed obsolete in the present age, and are evaded by others, who acknowledge the cogency of these laws. *These* commonly make a vow to abstain from flesh-meat, and consider that vow as more binding than the precepts here alluded to. Others, again, not only eat meat at obsequies and solemn sacrifices, but make it their common diet, in direct breach of the institutes of their religion.” (Vide Colebrooke, Religious Ceremonies of Hindoos, vol. vii, p. 271, Asiatic Researches.)

⁸ For “the genius of death be-

comes eager to destroy Brahmens, through a neglect of reading the Vedas.....and through various offences in diet.” (Institutes of Menu, chap. v.) And the Gentoo code, after insisting on the innocence of the first men, goes on to say, that soon “men employed themselves in all occupations of debauchery and iniquity, and assumed the licentiousness of eating things forbidden,” &c.: thus placing the taking of forbidden meats among the cardinal sins.—Halhed’s Gentoo Code.

⁹ Menu, chap. v. 5, &c.

¹ Dubois says they reject all vegetables the root or head of which is round.—Mœurs des Indes, vol. i, p. 258.

of "the thickened milk of the cow, within ten days after her calving, nor of the milk of either the camel or other animal with a hoof not cloven; nor of that of any forest beast except the buffalo; nor of the milk of a woman, nor any thing naturally sweet, but acidulated, except buttermilk, and every preparation of buttermilk."²

In former times also, when the doctrine of transmigration had not yet fully developed itself:³ when flesh was still occasionally eaten; the twice-born man was enjoined to avoid "carnivorous birds, and such as live in towns, and solitary animals, and quadrupeds with uncloven hoofs, and creatures with five claws (except those allowed in the Vedas, &c.), birds that strike with their beaks, web-footed birds, and those who dive to devour fish, all amphibious fish-eaters, tame hogs, and fish of every sort."⁴ But the animal whose flesh it was a deadly offence to eat was not in itself, it seems, necessarily impure. For the life of a cat, or an ichneumon, of a frog or a lizard, an owl or a crow,—all of them non-edible animals,—is put on the same footing as that of a Sudra;⁵ and from the Rudhira'rhya'ya⁶ we learn, that "birds, tortoises, alligators, fish, nine species of animals, lions, tigers, men, &c., are looked upon as proper oblations; "and as that which has been destroyed for the purpose of sacrifice attains in the next world an exalted birth,"⁷ we may presume that that alone can be sacrificed which is dear to the gods, and clean, pure, and holy.⁸

² Menu, chap. v. 5, &c.

³ Buddha seems to have been the first who censured the sacrifice and eating of animals, (vol. i, Asiatic Researches, p. 236.) And in Menu, chap. v, verse 30, I find that, "He who eats according to law commits no sin, even though every day he took the flesh of such animals as may lawfully be eaten; since both animals, who may be eaten and those who eat them, are equally created by Brahme."

⁴ Institutes of Menu, id.

⁵ Institutes of Menu, chap. xi.

63—69. "If a Brahmin kill by design a cat or an ichneumon, or a frog or a lizard, an owl or a crow, he must perform the ordinary penance required for the death of a sudra."

⁶ Vide Asiatic Researches, vol. v. art. xxiii.

⁷ Institutes of Menu, v. 408.

⁸ For the thousand other precepts relative to diet, the where and how food is to be received, eaten, &c., see Religious Ceremonies of the Hindus, by Colebrooke; Asiatic Researches, vol. vii. 277.

II. Among the Egyptian priests. According to Charemon, *many of them* altogether abstained from flesh, and *all* were forbidden to taste of fish and carnivorous birds, and of those quadrupeds that were unhorned or had clawed feet, or whose hoofs were uncloven.⁹ Like the Hindus, however, the Egyptians had some exceptions to these general rules, for they ate of the swan and the goose, and shuddered away, *with a holy reverence*, from the flesh of the ram and the cow, and, with the antipathy of hate, from that of the red ox and the pig, both of which they nevertheless occasionally sacrificed—the one to Typhon, the other to Hecate.¹ Like the Hindus, too, they held several non-edible animals in high honour, as cats, serpents, crocodiles, &c.² With the Egyptians, then, as with the Hindus, the notions of purity or impurity which were attached to the flesh of any animal, as food, did not extend to the animal itself; and did not, as with the Jews, exclude it from the altars of the gods.

III. Among the Persians. All living things were, by the law of Zoroaster, separated into two great and distinct families: the living things, the creation of Ormuzd; and the living things, the creation of Ahriman. *To the former* belonged all useful, *to the latter*, all noxious animals. *The one*, pure and holy, were to be loved, cherished, and preserved; *the other*, impure in themselves and making impure what they touched, were to be avoided, hated, and rooted out from the face of the earth. *As noxious* they regarded, first, all predatory animals, as lions, tigers, bears, &c.; se-

⁹ Την δὲ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν Αἴγυπτον. Ex iis quæ Ægyptus ipsa protulit, piscibus omnibus abstinebant, e quadrupedibus quotquot solidas aut multifidas haberent ungulas, aut cornutæ non essent, et vulncribus omnibus quæ carnes devorarent; multi etiam universis animalibus abstinebant.—De Esu Carn. c. i, 2, 5; from Spencer, De Leg. Jud. i, vii, p. 128.

¹ "Refert etiam Porphyrius

Ægyptios et Phœnices humanis vesci carminibus, quam vaccam morsu attingere maluisse..... Asinum etiam et bovem rufum tanquam animalia ad odium et contumeliam nati penitus aversebantur."—Id. ib.

² "Nam Ægyptii boves adorabant, et sacra serpentibus, crocodilis, belluis cæteris avibus et piscibus instituebant, hoc aperte dicit Minutius Felix."—Id. ib. p. 118.

condly, all animals which fear the light and love darkness, as moles, rats, mice, &c.; thirdly, all animals which creep or crawl, as snakes, toads, frogs, &c.; and, lastly, all insects, as flies, ants, &c.³ The flesh of no one of these animals could the Ormuzd worshipper touch without risk; and, though the Zend contains no dietary laws, much less, therefore, eat. *Of pure and clean animals, some were probably not considered edible, as the horse, the ass, the dog;*⁴ but of the edible *all* could be offered in sacrifice—if sacrifice that may be called, which was slaughtered indeed with certain religious ceremonies, but which was so slaughtered, not as an offering to Ormuzd, but to receive his blessing, and thus be rendered food more wholesome and more pure.⁵

If we review these several ordinances relating to meats and animals, we find—

I. That the Zend and Hebrew laws recognise but *two*, the Egyptian and Hindu books *several*, sorts of animals: *the former* regard all animals, the one as either noxious or useful—the other as either clean or unclean; both *the latter* speak of animals edible and non-edible, animals sacrificial and non-sacrificial, and animals sacred and profane.⁶

II. That the Zend law rejects all noxious animals, the productions of Ahriman, and holds up to religious abhorrence not merely the flesh of these animals, but the animals themselves. It is thus for ever precluded from any large

³ Bees? Anquetil, Cérémon. et Moral de Zoroastre, Zend. vol. ii, Fargard i, p. 681; id. vol. i, Fargard xiv, p. 266; id. Fargard xviii, p. 388, 411. As the production of Ahriman these animals are all to be destroyed; hence that custom of the magi (which astonished Herodotus) who, with their own hands, killed ants, serpents, &c.—Herod. lib. i, § 140.

⁴ Zend, vol. i, Fargard vii, p. 320; and Vie de Zoroastre, id. p. 25, 26. The Amschaspand Bahman tells Zoroaster: “Je vous livre les animaux et les troupeaux; que les Mobeds apprennent à en avoir

soin. Il ne faut tuer *ni les animaux jeunes*, ni ceux qui sont encore utiles.”

⁵ We may gather this from the account of Herodotus. He tells us that after the slaughter of the victim, the magus sings a sacred hymn; but that after a little time, *επισχων δε ολιγον χρονον, αποφερται ο θυσας τα χρεα, και χραται οτι μιν ο λογος αρειει.*—Herod. lib. i, § cxxxii.

⁶ Among the Hindus and Egyptians, as sacrificial animals are sometimes edible, sometimes non-edible, and sometimes even profane, they must form a class of themselves.

view of the beauty, order, harmony, and usefulness of all creation.

III. That the Egyptian law, though it recommends abstinence from some kinds of food for sanatory reasons, objects to others from religious motives. Some animals it so abhors, or so reverences, that it will not permit its subjects to touch of their flesh.

IV. That the Hindu books forbid the use of animal food, from the high esteem in which they hold all life, and from the peculiar view which they take of the state of the soul after death;—a view which obtained also in Egypt, and occasionally led to the same results.

V. That the Jewish law, by the general rules which it lays down to distinguish clean from unclean meats,—rules which admit of no exception, and which rank among the unclean many noble and useful animals—clearly shows that it was induced to this classification by no fanciful or superstitious motives, but that its sole object was to reduce all edible animals under one head, and thus to render it easy for every, the simplest, man to ascertain what animals were or were not edible. It probably merely determined and sanctioned the ancestral usages of the Israelites.

VI. That Persians, Egyptians, and Hindus,⁷ necessarily view with disgust and horror all men who eat of the flesh of some of those animals from which they abstain,—not so, however, the Jew: though, indeed, the terms by which his law designates its non-edible animals—a term certainly not in accordance with the spirit of its cosmogony, and rather Persian than Jewish—will no doubt induce a spirit of self-gratulation and self-conceit, which must effectually prevent any social intercourse with foreigners.

VII. That all these religions regard the animal creation as existing solely for man's sake and service; they consider

⁷ The Persian faith is alone consequent in its hate of some animals—they are the productions of Ahriman. For why should the Egyptian hate the pig or the red ox? Why the Hindu make dis-

inction between one animal and another? Why the Jew designate as unclean two-thirds of the whole creation? One God, they all believe, made all things, and, the Jews believe, made all things well.

animals not as they are in themselves, but merely as they stand in some relation with man's wants, or his interests.

Verses 11, 12. The same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up.

If ever there was a deluge, that that deluge could take place only because, and in the way, God willed it to take place, no man can doubt.⁸ Yet all who hesitate to receive the book of Genesis as an unquestionable authority, will necessarily inquire, "Was there ever a deluge?"

They who believe in the inspiration of Moses will argue that his testimony on this point is confirmed,

I. By the several phenomena which the earth itself presents to our notice. Its various irregular and broken strata bear evidence that, in long past ages, our globe has undergone sundry violent changes; and the fossil remains of shells and marine animals not unfrequently found on the tops of even its highest mountains prove that, among these changes, some one at least was brought about by a deluge.⁹

II. By the similar testimony of different nations. India, Chaldea, Egypt, Greece, China, Persia, and several of the people of the new world, have treasured up legends of a universal flood, by which, as in the deluge of Moses, the human race, with the exception of a few individuals, was entirely destroyed. And, as so improbable an event as a deluge could scarcely have been independently imagined in

⁸ The English editor of Calmet's Dictionary, and Michaelis (Commentary, ad. h. l.) endeavour to show, that the means which, according to Moses, the Deity makes use of to bring about the deluge, are fully sufficient. I see no advantage in exercising one's ingenuity in conjectures of this sort. For, if we regard the books of Moses as the words of the Deity, we cannot a moment hesitate to believe that the means by which the Deity is there represented to have flooded the earth were the best and most fitted

for that purpose. If, on the other hand, we judge these books as we would any other work, then, as they here treat of facts of which we can have no experience, and of causes which are no longer in operation, we cannot inquire whether the causes were sufficient to produce the effects, though we may, whether of the effects any traces are yet to be found, either in the earth itself, or in the traditions of its different inhabitants.

⁹ Vide Woodward's History of the Earth.

so many and such distant countries, we may fairly presume that the traditions of it are founded on fact.

Now, without staying to object, that, though frequent deposits of marine fossil remains may be very fair evidence that our globe was once covered by water, they no way prove that it was ever so covered by a deluge,—we will merely remark, *on the first reason*, that the huge masses, the large and deep strata, which these remains form, are, if evidence of a deluge, evidence of one which no way corresponds with that described in Genesis. Because,

1st. The deluge of Moses is *no convulsion*: the rain pours down from heaven, and rivers and seas indeed overflow their banks, sweeping away man and beast and perhaps shattering and destroying in their course man's immortal works; but, after one year's space, the earth appears already dry, the olive has again put forth its leaves,¹ and the fields are green, and every thing once more wears its wonted and familiar appearance. *Our fossil strata*, on the other hand, tell of, and are only to be accounted for by, fearful and violent convulsions,² by which all nature was rent, and the face of the earth changed, and thus rendered incapable of bearing fruit and green herb for perhaps centuries. And because,

2ndly. While the fossil bones found in these strata—and each one of these strata is connected with some particular convulsion—speak of several animal creations, whose species are almost invariably, and whose genera are sometimes now, extinct: *no* remains have yet been met with which can induce to the conclusion, that among the animal races which peopled the preadamite worlds, man was included. But man it is that the deluge of Moses destroyed; man possessing arts; man powerful, and probably numerous;

¹ "A judicious remark has been made (by Mr. Bankes) respecting the choice of the olive as the emblem of peace. After the devastation of a country by hostile invasion and the consequent neglect of its culture, no plantation requires a

longer period to restore to it its previously flourishing condition than the olive grove."—Wilkinson's *Modern Egyptians*, vol. i, p. 415. How gentle, then, must have been the deluge!

² Vide Cuvier *Révol. du Globe*.

but as of man these strata contain no relics,³ to the deluge of Moses, the *human* deluge, in contradistinction to other convulsions which affected our earth, none of these strata can, with any show of probability, be referred.

And now with regard to the second reason, brought forward as corroboratory of this deluge in Genesis, to estimate it properly, it will be necessary to examine more at large the several traditions to which it appeals. And,

I. The Hindus believe, "that in the reign of the sun-born monarch *Satyavrata*, the whole earth was drowned, and the whole human race destroyed by a flood, except the pious prince himself, the seven Rishis, and their several wives This general *pralaya*, or destruction, is the subject of the first Purana, or sacred poem; and the story is, besides, concisely told, in the eighth book of the Bhagawata, from which the following is an abridged extract:—
"The demon Hayagriva having purloined the Vedas from the custody of Brahma, while he was reposing, at the close of the sixth Manwantara, the whole race of men became corrupt, except the seven Rishis and Satyavrata, who then reigned in Dravira, a maritime region to the south of Carnata. This prince was performing his ablutions in the river Critamala, when Vishnu appeared to him in the shape of a small fish, and, after several augmentations of bulk in different waters, was placed by Satyavrata in the ocean, where he thus addressed his amazed votary: 'In seven days, all creatures who have offended me, shall be destroyed by a deluge; but thou shalt be secured in a capacious vessel miraculously formed. Take, therefore, all kinds of medicinal herbs and esculent grain for food, and, together with the seven holy men, your respective wives, and pairs of all animals, enter the ark without fear: then shalt thou know God face to face, and all thy questions shall be answered.' Saying this, he disappeared; and, after seven days, the ocean began to overflow the coasts, and the earth to be flooded by constant showers, when Satyavrata, meditating on the Deity, saw a large vessel

³ Vide Buckland, Bridgewater Treatise, vol. i, p. 19.

moving on the waters : he entered it ; having in all respects conformed to the instructions of Vishnu, who, in the form of a vast fish, suffered the vessel to be tied, with a great sea serpent, as with a cable, to his measureless horn. When the deluge had ceased, Vishnu slew the demon, and recovered the Vedas, instructed Satyavrata in divine knowledge, and appointed him the seventh Menu, by the name of Vaivaswata.”⁴

II. The Chaldeans believed that, during the reign of Xisuthrus, tenth king of Babylon, and the son, in one place, of Otiartes, and, in another, of Ardates,⁵ happened a great deluge, the history of which is thus described :—“The Deity Chronus appeared to this Xisuthrus in a vision, and warned him that, upon the fifteenth day of the month Dæsius, there would be a flood, by which mankind would be destroyed. He, therefore, enjoined him to write a history of the beginning, procedure and conclusion of all things, and to bury it in the city of the Sun at Lippara ; and to build a vessel, and take with him into it his friends and relations ; and to convey on board every thing necessary to sustain life, together with all the different animals, both birds and quadrupeds, and trust himself fearlessly to the deep. Having asked the Deity, whither he was to sail ? he was answered, ‘to the gods ;’ upon which, he offered up a prayer for the good of mankind. He then obeyed the Divine admonition, and built a vessel five stadia in length, and two in breadth. Into this he put every thing which he had prepared ; and, last of all, conveyed into it, his wife, and children, and friends After the flood had been upon the earth, and was, in time, abated, Xisuthrus sent out birds from the vessel, which, not finding any food, nor any place whereupon they might rest their feet, returned to him again. After an interval

⁴ Vide On the Chronology of the Hindus, by Sir W. Jones, vol. ii, p. 116-7, Asiatic Researches. A somewhat fuller account is also given in another volume of the same work, (vol. i, p. 230.) Compare with these,

as slightly differing from them the account in the Oupnek’hat, c. xx. p. 481.

⁵ Vide Cory’s Ancient Fragments, p. 26, 31, from Berossus.

of some days, he sent them forth a second time, and they now returned with their feet tinged with mud. He made a trial a third time with these birds; but they returned to him no more: from which he judged that the surface of the earth had appeared above the waters. He, therefore, made an opening in the vessel, and, upon looking out, found that it was stranded upon the side of some mountain, upon which he immediately quitted it, with his wife, his daughter, and the pilot. Xisuthrus then paid his adoration to the earth; and, having constructed an altar, offered sacrifices to the gods, and, with those who had come out of the vessel with him, disappeared . . . They who remained within, finding that their companions did not return, quitted the vessel with many lamentations, and called continually on the name of Xisuthrus. Him they saw no more; but they could distinguish his voice in the air, and could hear him admonish them to pay due regard to religion; and he likewise informed them that it was upon account of his piety, that he was translated to live with the gods; and that his wife and daughter, and the pilot had obtained the same honour. To this he added, that they should return to Babylonia, and, as it was ordained, search for the writings at Lippara, which they were to make known to all mankind. Moreover, that the place wherein they then were, was the land of Armenia.”⁶

III. Of the deluge, the traditions of Egypt, so far as they are known, afford no details. Manetho, as quoted by Syncellus and Eusebius, asserts merely that he drew the materials for his history “from the inscriptions which were engraved in the sacred dialect and hieroglyphic character,” upon the columns set up in the Seriadie land by Thoth

⁶ Vide Cory’s Ancient Fragments. p. 26, &c. From Georgius Syncellus and Eusebius; and see also Fabricius Bib. Græc. vol. xiv, p. 180; from Abydenus.

⁷ Huetius, of the Egyptian Antiquities: “Mirabiles imprimis fuere subterranei quidam secessus, prope Thebas Ægyptias, quos Syringes

appellabant, magno labore excavati, veteribus memorati, *Ammiano* præcipue, qui eorum parietibus Hieroglyphicas literas insculptas fuisse perhibet *ante Diluvium*, a viris qui calamitatis hujus præscii priscorum rituum rationem ad posteritatis memoriam hac arte commendarunt.” —Demonst. Evangel. p. 57.

the first Hermes ; and, *after the deluge* (μετα τον κατακλυσμον), translated from the sacred dialect into the Greek tongue, in hieroglyphic characters, and committed to writing in books, and deposited by Agathodæmon, the son of the second Hermes, the father of Tat, in the penetralia of the temples of Egypt.”⁸

iv. Among the Greeks, we find the history of the Scythian Deucalion, “related by the Greeks after their manner, and it runs thus:—‘The present race of men is not the same as at the beginning: those of the first race all perished: mankind, as they now are, are a new and second race, that were spread abroad again by Deucalion in these vast numbers. Of those first men it is reported, *that they were haughty, fierce people*, who committed heinous iniquities; for they neither kept their oath, nor exercised hospitality, nor spared the vanquished, though imploring mercy. For all this, however, a horrible calamity came over them: all at once the waters burst forth from all parts of the earth, prodigious showers of rain poured down from above, the rivers swelled and overflowed, the sea rose far above its shores; in short, all was water, and all mankind were drowned. Deucalion alone was preserved, on account of his piety and good-nature, for the propagation of a new race; and that in the following manner: he had a very large chest, in which he packed his wives and children, and when they were all in, he at last went in himself. Just as he was entering, there came running to him, swine, horses, and all kinds of wild beast and creeping creatures; in one word, every animal that feeds upon the earth, *pair-wise*. He took them all in, and Jupiter instilled into them such peaceful dispositions, that they did him no harm, but they lived together in the most peaceful accord, and so they were all preserved in this single chest, as in a ship, as long as the flood lasted.’ This the Greeks relate touching Deucalion.”⁹

⁸ Cory’s Ancient Fragments, translation.) In the Timon, however, Lucian follows the more authentic Greek legend, and makes p. 168.

⁹ Lucian de Dea Syra, (Tooke’s authentic Greek legend, and makes

We have, also, the same catastrophe somewhat differently, and perhaps more authentically, related by Ovid. The world he represents "as confederate in crime," and doomed, therefore, to just punishment.¹ Jupiter sends down rain from heaven; and rivers and seas, gushing forth from their caves, gather over the earth's surface,

"And rushing onwards, with a sweepy sway,
Bear flocks and folds, and lab'ring hinds away."²

Mankind perishes. Deucalion and his wife alone, borne in a little skiff,³ are stranded on the top of Parnassus. By degrees the waters subside: and the only surviving pair ask of the gods how they may again people the desert earth. With veiled heads they are ordered to throw behind them the bones of their great mother. Half-doubting the sense of the oracle, they throw behind them stones, which are immediately changed into men and women, and the earth spontaneously produces the rest of the animal creation.⁴

Deucalion to escape in a little skiff, (consequently without the animals), and land on Mount Lycoris —Parnassus.

¹ "Qua terra patet, fera regnat Erynnys.
In facinus jurasse putes. Dent ocyus omnes,
Quas meruere pati (sic stat sententia) pœnas."

Ovid. Met. lib. i. 240.

² Id. ib. 265.

³ Apollodorus, Bib. lib. i, p. 23, calls the skiff, *λαρναξ*, a coffer. He thus narrates the myth:—"When Jupiter determined to destroy the brazen race, Deucalion, by the advice of Prometheus, made a great ark, *λαρνακα*, and put into it all necessary things, and entered it with Pyrrha. Jupiter then pouring down heavy rains from heaven, overwhelmed the greatest part of Greece, so that all men perished, except a few who fled to the highest mountains. He floated nine days and nights in the sea of waters, and at last stopped on Mount Parnassus. Then Jupiter sent Mercury to ask him what he wished, and he solicited that mankind might

be made again. Jupiter bade him to throw stones over his head, from which men should come, and that those cast by Pyrrha should be turned into women." (From Sharon Turner's Sacred History, vol. ii.) Near this legend I must place that of the Tamanaiks:—"They stated that in the great deluge a man and woman saved themselves on a high mountain, called Pamanaca, situated on the banks of the Ariveru; and casting behind them over their heads the fruit of the Mauritia palm-tree, they saw the seeds contained in those fruits produce men and women, who re-peopled the earth." (From Von Humboldt's Personal Narrative, vol. iv, p. 471.

⁴ Ovid. Met. lib. i, ver. 384, &c.

v. Of the people of the new world, and i. Of the Mexicans :—

1st. The Tlascalans⁵ believed that, though the world was eternal, it had twice changed its form, once by deluge, and by tempest once ; they asserted, also, that those who had been preserved had been changed into monkeys, but had afterwards recovered their form and reason.

2ndly. The Mexicans⁶ preserved traditions of a deluge, which had destroyed all animals, with the exception of one man and his wife, who escaped in a boat. The man was called Concox, the woman Chichequetzel. This happy pair arrived at the foot of the mountain Culhuacan, and there engendered a great number of children, who were all born dumb, but who one day received the gift of speech from a dove, which came and perched itself on a lofty tree. Not understanding, however, one another's language, they determined on separating, &c. And,

3rdly. The Mechoacans⁷ narrated, that mankind, having forgotten their duties and their origin, had been punished by an universal deluge, from which the priest Tezpi, and

⁵ " Le monde étoit éternel dans leurs idées ; mais ils croyoient sur d'anciennes traditions, qu'il avoit changé deux fois de forme, l'une par un déluge, et l'autre par la force du vent et des tempêtes," &c. —From Herrera, Hist. Gén. des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 597, ed. Hol.

⁶ " Les anciennes histoires des Méxiquains rapportent (dit-on) quelques circonstances d'un déluge qui fit périr tous les hommes et les animaux, à l'exception d'un homme et d'une femme, qui se sauvèrent dans une de ces barques qu'on nomme *Acalles*.....L'homme s'appelloit Concox, et la femme Chichequetzel. Cet heureux couple arriva au pied de la montagne du Culhuacan.....Il y mit au monde un grand nombre d'enfants, qui naquirent tous muets, et qui reçurent un jour la faculté de parler, d'une colombe qui vint se percher sur un arbre fort haut. Mais l'un n'en-

tendant pas la langage de l'autre, ils prirent la partie de se séparer." —Id. ib. p. 341. These traditions are corroborated by the Mexican pictures examined by Humboldt. See Sharon Turner's Sacred History.

⁷ " Ils racontoient.....que les hommes étant tombés dans l'oubli de leurs devoirs et de leur origine, ils avoient été punis par une déluge universel, à l'exception d'un prêtre Indien, nommé Tezpi, qui s'étoit mis avec sa femme et ses enfans dans un grand coffre de bois, où il avoit rassemblé aussi quantité d'animaux et d'excellentes sémences ; qu'après la retraite des eaux il avoit lâché un oiseau nommé *Aura*, qui n'étoit pas revenu, et successivement plusieurs autresmais que le plus petit avoit reparu bientôt avec la branche d'un arbre dans son bec."—Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 590.

his wife and children, had been alone preserved. Tezpi shut himself up in a great chest of wood, into which he also put all sorts of animals and useful seeds; and they said that, after the waters had subsided, he sent out a bird called Aura, which did not return to him, and afterwards several others; but that the smallest at length reappeared with the branch of a tree in his beak.

II. Among the Peruvians, we find that it is believed, "that on a time it rained so exceedingly that it drowned all the lower countries, and all men, save a few, which got into caves upon high hills, where they shut up themselves close, that no rain could get in: there they had stored much provision and living creatures. And when they perceived that it had done raining, they sent forth two dogges, but they returning all myrie and foule, they knew that the waters had not yet ceased: after that they sent forth more dogges, which came back again dry. Then did they goe forth to people the earth, but were mightily afflicted with multitudes of great serpents, which had sprung up out of those mirie reliques of the flood; but at last they killed them."^s

III. Among the North American Indians, "quite generally, there is a tradition of the deluge, dimly discoverable under some form, though curiously connected with ideas which have no relation to the truth. The ancient five nations supposed (according to Charlevoix) that there were three generations of a certain family on the earth before the flood; that, when this came, they were all destroyed; and that, to re-people the earth afterwards, beasts were changed into men."

"The traveller Henry gathered a different account among some of the Lake tribes. 'A person of great character,' say they, 'the father of all the Indian nations, lived originally towards the setting sun, where, being warned in a dream that a flood was coming, he built a raft, on which he afterwards preserved his own family, and

^s Vide Purchas his Pilgrimage, book ix, c. ix, p. 723, 729; and see Deluge of Nicaruaga, ib. p. 686.

the whole of the animal world. His raft drifted about many months during the deluge, till he began at length to despair; and even the animals he had saved, having the gift of speech, murmured loudly against him. Finally, a new earth was made, and man and the animals placed upon it. The use of speech was afterwards taken from the latter, on account of a conspiracy which they entered into against man, the bear being the ringleader of the plot."⁹

VI. In China we find, in the earliest sacred books, frequent, though not very precise, mention of a deluge. The waters are represented as covering the hills on every side, and overtopping the mountains, and reaching even to heaven, and the people as struck with terror, and perishing.¹

And VII. The orthodox, among the ancient Persians, according to Hyde, speak of a universal deluge, sent upon the earth to punish the wickedness of man.²

These various legends, at a first glance, seem strongly to confirm the Jewish.

I. Because they are all founded on the same great event,—the almost total destruction of the human race by a deluge.

II. Because their details all, more or less, accord with those of this great catastrophe, as preserved in the Jewish books.

Thus, 1st. The Hindu, Scytho-Greek, Greek, Mechoacan, and Persian legends, attribute each one its deluge to the corruption and wickedness of mankind.

2ndly. In the Hindu, Chaldaic, Greek,³ and Lake-tribe

⁹ Vide Thatcher, *Indian Traits*, vol. ii, c. viii, p. 148-9.

¹ "Le texte du Chou-king sur le deluge: L'Empereur Yao dit, Hélas de l'univers! des eaux immenses sont répandues! O qu'elles sont élevées! elles entourent les collines, surpassent les montagnes, elles montent jusqu'au ciel."—Mémoires des Chinois, vol. i, p. 319; and compare Des Guignes' translation of Chou-king, p. 8, 9.

² "Veterum Persarum orthodoxi credunt diluvium, idque fuisse universale et totam terram occupasse.....*Ex Zoroastris* autem sententiâ aiunt quod non fuisset diluvium, nisi propter iniquitatem et diabolica præstigia nequissimi hominis, Malcus, (intelligunt Cain)" &c. &c.—Hyde de Rel. Vet. Pers. c. x, p. 171.

³ Vide note³ to p. 193, from Apollodorus.

legends, the persons saved from the deluge, are so saved, in consequence of some divine warning.

3rdly. In the Hindu, Chaldaic, Scytho-Greek, Greek, Mexican, Mechoagan, and Lake-tribe legends, the means of safety or preservation are an ark, skiff, or raft.

4thly. Among the Hindus, Chaldees, Scytho-Greeks, Greeks, Mexicans, Mechoagans, and Lake Tribes, the number of persons saved is small, and generally confined to a single family.

5thly. Besides certain individuals saved from the deluge, Hindus, Chaldees, Scytho-Greeks, Mechoacans, Peruvians, and the Lake Tribes, make mention of all sorts of animals, as saved with them.

6thly. After the deluge had been some time upon the earth, the Chaldees and the Mechoacans, like the Jews, describe the persons in the ark as, from time to time, sending forth birds; and the Peruvians, hid in the cave, as sending out dogs, to ascertain whether the land was yet dry.

7thly. The Chaldees and Greeks represent the individuals preserved as offering sacrifice immediately on their quitting the ark.

8thly. All, with the exception of the Greek and two⁴ of the American legends, represent the present race of men as the descendants of those persons who were saved from the deluge.

And 9thly. The Chaldaic and several of the American legends, accord with the Jewish in connecting with the deluge the variety of languages found among man.

If, however, we now enter into a critical examination of these several traditions, we will begin by at once excluding,

1st. The Persian deluge. And this,

First, because it rests on no sufficient authority:⁵ for it

⁴ The Tamaiaiks (vide note as above, from Humboldt) and the Five Nations. Vide Legend, p. 195.

⁵ The authorities quoted by Hyde are Mahomedan writers—not in

this instance only, but throughout his work—of which Mosheim says: “Liber pereruditus, at indigestus et conjecturis parum probabilibus passim refertus.”

is no where mentioned, or even hinted at, in the Zenda-vesta. And,

Secondly, because it is an event which not only does not accord with, but actually stands in direct contradiction to, the whole scheme of creation as expounded by Zoroaster.⁶

And 2ndly. The Chinese deluge. And this, because it is clearly not a universal deluge, but merely an accidental flood. For Chun, the successor of Yao, speaks of it as of an inundation, which he had himself witnessed, and, to avert the evils of which, he and his nobles had laboured;⁷ by supplying the people with boats, and garnering up grain and other provisions for them; and, afterwards, by cutting canals and channels, for the purpose of draining the land.⁸

Among the remaining deluges, we will also observe,

1st. That *the Egyptian*, of which we have no details, and *the Chaldean*, viewed independently of its details (if we may form a judgment of *the one*, from the testimony of either Plato or Censorinus,⁹ and, of *the other*, from that of Seneca,¹) are

⁶ Vide p. 113, 114, supra. Sharon Turner, however, finds a deluge in the Boun-Dehesch. But this deluge, if it be a deluge, has for its object the regeneration or renovation of our earth, infested with Kharfesters, and burnt up with the fires of Ahriman: it, besides, precedes the creation of man.

⁷ "Ensuite il ajouta, Venez, Yu. Quand nous eûmes tant à craindre de la grande inondation, vous travaillâtes avec ardeur et avec droiture."—Des Guignes' translation of Chou-king, part i, c. iii, p. 26.

⁸ "Yu continua ainsi: Quand la grande inondation s'éleva jusqu'au ciel.....alors j'employai les quatre Tsai (barques pour les rivières, voitures pour les montagnes, &c.) Je suivis les montagnes, et je coupai les bois. Avec Y je fis des provisions de grains et de chair d'animaux pour faire subsister les peuples. Dans les neuf parties du monde, je ménageai des lits pour les rivières, et je les fis couler vers

les quatre mers. Au milieu des campagnes je creusai des canaux, pour communiquer avec les rivières," &c.—part i, chap. v, p. 35.

⁹ Plato, in the *Timæus*, says that the Egyptian philosophers informed Solon that the world had suffered often by water and by fire: πολλὰι φθοραὶ· πῦρ μὲν ἡ ὕδατι μέγισται,moreover, "certis temporum curriculis illuvies immissa cælitus omnia populatur; multaque et varia hominum fuere exitia; ideo qui succedunt et litteris et musis orati sunt." And vide Censorinus "Of the Great Year," in Cory's *Fragments*, p. 323.

¹ "Berossus, qui Belum interpretatus est, ait cursu ista siderum fieri: et adeo quidem id affirmat, ut conflagrationi atque diluvio tempus assignet; arsura enim terrena contendit, quando omnia sidera, quæ nunc diversos agunt cursus, in Cancrum convenerint, sic sub eodem posita vestigio, ut recta linea exire per orbes omnium possit:

each but links in a series of periodical occurrences, which, as they are wholly determined by astronomical phenomena, may probably rest, not on any living and popular tradition, but on the consequential reasonings of astrological priests;² in a word, these deluges may be, not events *remembered* however darkly, but events *imagined* to suit particular theories.

2ndly. That the Hindu deluge, with which perhaps the Egyptian and Chaldean may be connected, avowedly expresses but one of those deaths and births to which, according to the doctrine of the Brahmins, our world like ourselves has been, and ever will be, subject,³—until time is no more, and all individual and special existence is lost in the universality of the great Brahme.

Of the legends connected with these several deluges, we regard with suspicion,—

i. The Greek. For it seems to have been unknown to both Homer and Hesiod. And Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon,⁴ while they place Deucalion among the first kings of the Hellenes, are silent on that great catastrophe with which his name is so intimately connected. In the odes of Pindar⁵ we first hear of the Deucalion deluge, but *there* it is confined to, and localized in, Greece. Plato⁶ next speaks of it, and speaks of it as universal, but speaks of deluges generally, as of periodical accidents by which the priests of Egypt accounted for man's unsteady progress, and even regress, in the arts and sciences. Aristotle knows of a local inundation near Dodona merely. With Apollodorus⁷ (and the scene is still confined to Greece)

inondationem futuram, cum eadem siderum turba in Capricornum convenerit. Illic solstitium, hic luna conficitur.”—Seneca, Nat. Quæst. iii, 29; Cory, 322.

² Are not the several opinions with regard to the Egyptian deluge, mentioned by Diodorus, lib. i, c. x, confirmatory of this view of the case?

³ Vide Wilford, in Asiatic Researches, vol. v, p. 244: and

Dubois, Mœurs des Indes, vol. ii, p. 99.

⁴ Herod. lib. i, § 56; Thucyd. lib. i. § 3.

⁵ Pindar, Od. Olym. ix, speaks of Deucalion as landing on Parnassus, and re-creating his people with stones, &c.

⁶ Plato, beginning of the third book De Legibus; Timæus, and Critias. Vide note ⁹, p. 198, supra.

⁷ Apollod. Biblio. i. 23; and vide

the legend first begins to acquire shape and consistency,—he mentions the ark *λαρνακα*. After a lapse of more than two centuries, in Plutarch⁸ we meet with the doves. A few more years, and Lucian knows of the ark, and of the animals running to it pair-wise: in him the legend wears an Asiatic dress. In general,⁹ then, we find that the more modern the author, the more nearly the details of this deluge correspond with those of the Mosaical; and we conclude, therefore, that the legend which narrates it, whether as told by Lucian¹ or by Ovid, because it is most probably not of Grecian origin, though, from local circumstances it has been attached to the name of Deucalion, adds little or no weight to the Mosaical testimony in favour of a universal deluge.

II. The *Chaldaic*. For it so agrees with *the Jewish* tradition, as to induce the belief that they both have a common origin, or that one is borrowed from the other; for both² traditions are particular in dates: in both the

note³, p. 193, supra. But we must remember that he was acquainted with the books of Berossus.

⁸ Incidentally merely—in treating on the instincts of animals.

⁹ Compare, for the whole of this, Cuvier, *Révolutions du Globe*, p.

157, &c. with Sharon Turner, *Sacred History*, vol. ii.

¹ Pindar lived in the fifth century B. C.; Apollodorus, about a century B. C. Plutarch died A. D. 140; Lucian, A. D. 180.

² *The Jewish legend compared with the CHALDAIC:—*

“In the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains,” &c.

“And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me.”

“Make thee an ark of gopher wood: the length of the ark shall be three hundred cubits, the breadth of it five cubits,” &c.

“And thou shalt come into the ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons’ wives with thee; and of every living thing of all flesh two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark; and take unto thee of all food that is eaten,” &c.

“After

“Upon the fifteenth day of the month Dæsius, there would be a flood.”

“The deity Chronus appeared to Xisuthrus in a vision, and warned him,” &c. “by which mankind would be destroyed.”

“He therefore enjoined him to... build a vessel..... And he built a vessel five stadia in length, and two in breadth.”

“And enjoined him to take with him into it his friends and relations, and to convey on board every thing necessary to sustain life, together with all the different animals, both birds and quadrupeds.”

“After

Deity appears to his favoured servant, and warns him of the approaching deluge, and bids him build a vessel of a certain size, and to take with him into it his family and a sufficiency of food, and animals of all sorts, &c. In both too, after the flood has abated, they in the ark or ship three times send forth birds to ascertain whether the earth is yet dry, which birds *twice* return, because they find no food, nor any place where they may rest their feet: after the third trial, however, the inmates of the ark, in both legends, remove the covering and look out, and the earth appears now above the surface of the waters, and they therefore quit the ark, and in both cases build altars and offer sacrifice to God.

Aware then that the Jews and Chaldees were, at several periods of their history, in intimate relation with each other, we cannot but inquire, as the legends are so circumstantially alike, with which of the two nations the legend is original?

In favour of a Chaldaic origin we may observe :

1st. That the Chaldeans were a nation while the fathers

JEWISH :—

“ After the waters returned from off the earth, Noah sent forth a raven, which went forth to and fro. Also he sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters *were abated* from off the face of the earth. But the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot, and she returned unto him into the ark. And he stayed yet other seven days, and again he sent forth the dove out of the ark; and the dove came to him in the evening; and lo, in her mouth was an olive leaf,” &c.

“ And Noah removed the covering of the ark; and behold, the face of the ground was dry.”

“ And Noah went forth, and his sons, and his wife,” &c. “ And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings upon the altar.”

CHALDAIC :—

“ After the flood had been upon the earth, and was in time abated, Xisuthrus sent out birds from the vessel; which, not finding any food, nor any place whereupon they might rest their feet, returned to him again. After an interval of some days, he sent them forth a second time, and they now returned with their feet tinged with mud. He made trial a third time with these birds, and they returned to him no more.

“ He therefore made an opening in the vessel; and upon looking out, found that it was stranded upon the side of a mountain.”

“ Upon which he immediately quitted the vessel, with his wife, his daughter, and the pilot. Xisuthrus then...having constructed an altar, offered sacrifices to the Gods,” &c.

of the Jewish people were yet unborn; and that as out of Chaldea came the first great ancestor of the Jews, so out of Chaldea Abraham probably brought with him all legends connected with events antecedent to his own time.

2ndly. That the relations in which the Chaldees stood to the Jews, were always those of superior to inferior—relations not in general favourable to a borrowing or imitative spirit;—and *this* the Jews seem to have felt; for Josephus,³ while he endeavours to show the reasonableness of the traditions of his people by appealing to those of the Chaldeans, never once hints that these last may have been borrowed from the Jewish records.

And 3rdly. That, in general, the Jews seem to have been at no time disinclined to seize upon and appropriate the customs and views of other nations; as may be seen from their laws,⁵ many of which evince an Egyptian origin; from their later prophecies,⁶ which bear the decided impress of the Persian mind; and lastly, from the literature of the Hellenistic Jews,⁷ which everywhere betrays a desire to adapt the sense of Scripture to, and expound it by, the the writings of Plato and other Greek philosophers.

In favour of a Jewish origin, we may adduce:

1st. The comparatively modern age of Berossus, who is supposed to have flourished in the reign of Alexander the Great, in whose time the Hebrews began to be known to, and already to excite the attention of, the then civilized world.

And 2ndly. The fact that Berossus himself, in his account

³ Josephus contra Apion, i, 19; Arch. i. 6.

⁴ As an instance of this appropriating spirit, and one applicable to the subject before us, we may remark, that in his account of the deluge Josephus himself borrows either from the Chaldean or Egyptian legend, when he states that the children of Seth, in anticipation of the deluge, raised two pillars, one of brick, the other of stone, on which they engraved, in order that they might preserve them, their acqui-

sitions in science and their discoveries in the arts. Vide Josephus, Antiq. lib. i, c. ii; and compare legend ii from Berossus, iii from Manetho.

⁵ Vide Marsham, Canon Chron. passim; Spenser, De Legibus Hebr. ditto; and comp. Witsius Ægyptiaca.

⁶ Vide Gesenius, Commentar. üb. d. Jesaja, über Kap. 13, 14, 21, 24-27, 34-35, and 40-66.

⁷ Vide Philo's Lehrbegriff by Stahl in Eichhorn. Bib. der Bib. Lit. vol. iv.

of the tower of Babel, evinces a knowledge of the Hebrew language, and of the early Hebrew traditions.⁸

In comparing the arguments severally adduced in favour of a Chaldaic or a Jewish origin for this legend, we must observe that *the claims of the Chaldees* are supported by conjectural reasons only, which even allowing them the full force of positive evidence, will but prove that a universal deluge was a Chaldaic tradition; while *those of the Jews*, limited to the legend in its actual shape, rest on the Chaldaic historian's avowed knowledge of the Hebrew traditions, which he was thus enabled to borrow, and adapt to the heroes of his own nation. We regard therefore the legend, *in its details*, as a Hebrew, and not a Chaldaic legend; and *the bare fact*, the mere deluge, as *a fact* most probably traditionally preserved by both people, who, as they have a common origin, repeat the same thing on the same authority, and do not therefore add any weight to each other's evidence.

III. We regard with suspicion the legends of the New World.

1st. Because, even among tribes of the same nation, they very much differ one from the other.

2ndly. Because some of the legends, as the Mexican, and the Mechoacan especially, too nearly resemble the Hebrew; in fact, more nearly resemble it than does any other similar legend of the Old World, the Chaldean excepted.

3rdly. Because, though these people retain this precise and accurate remembrance of so distant an event as the deluge, they have lost all memory of other and comparatively modern events, fully as interesting to themselves;—thus, they are wholly ignorant of their own original,¹ &c.

⁸ Ο δε τοπος εν ᾧ πύργον ὠκοδομήσαν νυν Βαβυλων καλεῖται, δια τὴν συγχυσιν τοῦ περὶ τὴν διαλεκτοῦ πρωτος ἐναγρους· Εβραῖοι γὰρ τὴν συγχυσιν Βαβέλ καλοῦσι.—Berossus, Cory, Ancient Fragments, p. 35.

⁹ Taking it for granted that the Hebrew is the true legend, or ra-

ther that the book of Genesis contains a true narrative of the deluge, we then suppose that rude and uncivilized tribes have retained a more distinct knowledge of long-past events, than the most enlightened people of the Old Continents.

¹ Robertson's America, vol. i, book iv, p. 259.

And 4thly. Because, without at all impugning the good faith and honesty of the first historians of, and travellers in, the New World, we have some doubts of the accuracy of their testimony, when they speak of its religion and traditions.² For, with their imperfect knowledge of its languages, they necessarily misapprehended much that they heard; and being fervid religionists, they eagerly caught at any terms which reminded them of the legends of their own creed; and by their questions, each one of which was no doubt a suggestion, they probably induced these simple-minded people to give such a form and colour to the traditions³ they repeated, as might please and flatter the vanity of their all-powerful catechists.

IV. In addition, we may remark generally, that in all these legends, the Jewish⁴ excepted, the deluge is closely connected with the country in which each legend obtains. We may therefore be permitted to ask, whether they all refer to the same event; or whether they may not rather be traditions of different local inundations, each one of which was magnified into an universal deluge by the infant

² De Pauw, *Recherches Phil. sur les Américains*, vol. i, part iii, § i, p. 269; and Robertson's *America*, book iv, § vii, p. 367.

³ That the people of America should have some remembrance of a deluge or deluges was natural from the nature of their country (vide De Pauw, *Recherches sur les Américains*; Purchas, *Pilgrimage*, Of the Tinitiras, on the Orenoque, p. 699; also Condamine; and *Lettres Edifiantes*, quoted in Robertson's *America*, book iv, p. 252, note), and the Mexican drawings adduced by Sharon Turner from Humboldt, evince no more than a general tradition of some greater deluge than ordinary: "The drawing of the deluge represents the goddess of water descending towards the earth; Coxcox, the Noah of Mexico, and his wife, are seated on the branch of a tree covered with leaves, and floating amid the

waters."—*Researches*, vol. ii, p. 23. "Another painting represents Coxcox in the midst of the water, lying in a bark. The mountain, the summit of which, crowned by a tree, rises above the waters, is the peak of Colhuacan.....At the foot of the mountain appear the heads of Coxcox and his wife. The latter of them is known by the two tresses in the form of horns, which denote the female sex."—*Researches*, vol. ii, p. 64. From these simple drawings to the legend of the Mechoacans there is a long interval.

⁴ This exception is easily accounted for. The Jews, as a nomadic people, were attached to their ancestors, not to a country; and while, therefore, they care little about the country on which the ark rests, they insist strongly on their descent from the favoured son of him who was saved in that ark.

people whose world, probably bounded by the nearest mountains, it laid waste and whose ancestors it destroyed : and whether these people, finding traditions of some similar event among the different nations with which they afterwards came in contact, did not borrow one from the other the several details which give to all these legends the same family character ?

Having thus examined the different traditions of different people with regard to a deluge, and also stated some objections which may be made against their authenticity, originality, &c., we shall conclude by observing, that while we concede that these traditions are both numerous enough, and similar enough, to justify the believer in the inspiration of Moses in adducing them as evidence corroboratory of the truth of Moses' history :—we must also avow that, in our eyes, they are neither in their meaning sufficiently precise, nor as testimony sufficiently independent one of the other, to command our acceptance of the facts they preserve ;—they seem to us, in a word, to form rather an *excuse*, than a *ground*, for belief in a universal deluge.

Chapter viii. verses 1-3. To this incident of the dove, I see two objections :

1st. I do not comprehend why she should so willingly do Noah's bidding. In very truth, she could have been no common dove. Like the birds and beasts that grace our fairy tales, she is not subject to the vulgar laws of a merely animal nature ; she is endowed with higher instincts, and is fitted to do man service ; she has human thoughts, and is gifted with a human soul ;—or surely, raven-like, she would hover round the ark, which is her home, and which holds her mate, and her nest, and her young ; or, if she had indeed flown away into the wide and desert world to find some spot whereon she might rest the sole of her foot, having found that spot, either she would never have returned to her former prison, or she would return to it bearing with her mud on her feet or on her wings, as the doves of the Babylonian, or the dogs of the Peruvian,

legend,—some accidental mark, by which man could have guessed at the then state of the earth;⁵—but no olive-leaf, purposely plucked off, as a symbol for Noah that the world again wore some portion of her ancient fruitfulness and beauty.⁶

And 2ndly. I do not understand why Noah should employ this bird on such a service. For however pleasingly the dove adorns this otherwise dreary legend, she is in reality sent on a useless and unnecessary mission. She can teach Noah nothing which he could not much more readily, and more naturally and certainly, learn, by looking out of the window of his ark: for, did the ark rest on a plain, from its top he could see the mountains above him;—was it, on the other hand, stranded on a mountain, he could daily watch the gradual regress of the waters at his feet. Wherefore, then, send forth the dove?

And yet, these doves are found in many traditions. Is it not because they are mythic birds? As the echo of the popular mind, the myth builds with, and accounts for, popular notions: as the voice of Humanity however it speaks man's hopes, and fears, and wishes; and as the voice of infant, uneducated Humanity, it speaks them with all the naive and simple faith of childhood, which knows no laws of criticism, and is indifferent to all facts of observation and experience. The myth, then, while it loves the wonderful, and hesitates not to realize man's most extravagant phantasies, also willingly engages the affections on the side of national prejudices.

But the myth is the creation, not of one intellect, but of an age;—and as it comes forth at its first birth rude and bare, a mere outline, and is unchecked in its growth

⁵ Vide Babylonian and Peruvian Legends, p. 190, 195. The mud the Arabs have, however, added. Vide Wilkinson's Modern Egyptians, vol. i, p. 402, note.

⁶ If we suppose that the dove returned with an olive leaf, because she was then building her nest, and very naturally brought back with her any materials which might

serve that purpose, it will then be objected to us: 1st, That the return of a bird building its nest could be no evidence to Noah of the state of the earth; and 2dly, That if we suppose our bird to be building her nest this week, we cannot suppose her deserting it the next; and yet from her third mission she never returns.

by the fetters of writing, which, in very truth, kill to preserve;—and as it then lives in the hearts and on the lips of a people;—what wonder is it that it appropriates to itself any new incident; and, indifferent to all charges of plagiarism, gladly seizes, as its prey, upon every fresh marvel which arrests the attention, and captivates the fancy?⁷ Hence it is that so many myths, of so many different people—original, perhaps, among each people, in substance and objects—so nearly resemble one another in their details;—the several nations who possessed any one myth in common, having, with certain adaptations to suit popular notions, freely borrowed from, as they came into contact with, each other.

Chapter viii. verse 4: “For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth.” *Verse 10*: “After seven days, the waters of the flood were upon the earth.” *Chapter vii. verses 3, 4*: “And after the end of the one hundred and fifty days, the waters were abated, and the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat.” *Verse 5*: “In the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen.” *Verse 6*: “At the end of forty days Noah opened the window of the ark . . . and he sent forth a raven, and also he sent forth a dove.” . . . *Verse 10*: “And he stayed yet *other seven days*,” &c. *Verse 12*: “And he stayed yet *other seven days*.” *Verse 13*: “In the six hundredth and first year, of the first month, of the first day of the month, the waters were dried up. And on the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dried.”

I have already observed that I do not look upon the several seven days mentioned in these chapters as any evidence that the septenary cycle, as determined by the regular periodical recurrence of a sabbath, or day of rest,

⁷ As an illustration, vide: the Greek myth of the deluge in its several stages of development: and may I not also add, the Peruvian, which employs *dogs* to ascertain how far the waters have abated, *i. e.*, employs an animal which was unknown to Peru till after its discovery by the Spaniards. But might they not be the *alco*?

was known to Noah or the antediluvian world. For, to be evidence of such a cycle, these several seven days must all of them either begin or close with a sabbath. If, therefore, Noah enters the ark on a sabbath day, on a sabbath day, also, the fountains of the great deep will be broken up: and on a sabbath day the raven and the dove will be sent forth to ascertain the state of the earth. But, if we follow the natural course of the story, we find, that, on the seventh day after Noah enters the ark, the deluge begins, and that it prevails for nine months, or one hundred and fifty days; that it then gradually decreases for two months and thirteen days, or seventy-three days, i. e. until the first day of the tenth month, on which day the tops of the mountains are seen; and that, forty days after this time, Noah sends forth the raven; and, seven days after, the dove. We have, then, from the entrance of Noah into the ark to the flight of the raven, a sum of two hundred and seventy-one days, a number no way divisible by seven. We may conclude, therefore, that each of the seven days were any seven days chosen arbitrarily, and not any seven days determined by the periodical recurrence of a particular feast.

If, however, we take another view of the narrative,^s and put aside the fifth verse of the eighth chapter as a parenthesis, and reckon the forty days of the sixth verse immediately after the one hundred and fifty days of deluge, we then have a sum of one hundred and ninety-seven days from the time Noah entered the ark to that on which he sent forth the raven. And if we suppose that he entered the ark on a sabbath, we shall find that the hundred and ninety-seventh day after that period will be itself a sabbath, as also both the first day of the tenth month (the day on which the tops of the mountains are first seen), and the twenty-eighth day of the second month of the six hundred and first year (the day probably on which Noah leaves the ark and builds an altar and sacri-

^s In reading chap. xxiv. 55, another view of this passage has presented itself to my mind. To the observations made on that chapter I refer the reader.

fices to the Lord. By a slight and no way forcible alteration, then, we have the principal events of the deluge all happening on and sanctifying a day which the Jewish mind delighted to honour. And we have, also, a regular Sab-batical cycle known and observed in the earliest ages, and now clearly not of Egyptian origin.

I wish I could adopt this *emendation*. I see however, *one*, but that a fatal, objection to it. By it the facts of the narrative are rendered inconsistent one with the other. For, if we adopt it, we then have the mountain tops first visible on the first of the tenth month, i. e. first visible on the seventy-fourth day from that on which the ark first rested on Ararat; and yet, on the fifty-fourth day from the same period, we find that olive trees have already put forth their leaves, and already appear above the surface of the water; i. e. we find that the olive, which is rarely met with above the girdle of any thing fit to be called a mountain,⁹ is free of the waters long before the tops of the mountains, which surely is impossible.

Verse 2. And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, &c.

“Spirits and Gods have vanished.” Crime and violence have driven Jehovah from His pleasant Eden. Heaven is now His dwelling-place: and man is no more admitted to

⁹ And certainly not Ararat. Tournefort thus describes it: “Nous commençames à monter ce jour-là le Mont Ararat, sur les deux heures après midi; mais ce ne fut pas sans peine. Il faut grimper dans des sables mouvans, où l’on ne voit que quelques pieds de *genièvre et d’épine de bouc*. Cette montagne est une des plus tristes et des plus désagréables aspects qu’il y ait sur la terre. On n’y trouve ni arbres, ni arbrisseaux. Encore moins de religieux Arméniens ou Francs... Il n’y a d’animaux vivans qu’au bas de la montagne et vers le milieu; ceux qui occupent la première région sont de pauvres ber-

gers, et des troupeaux galeux, parmi lesquels on voit quelques perdrix; ceux de la seconde région sont des tigres et des corneilles. Tout le reste de la montagne est couverte de neige depuis que l’arche s’y arrêta, et ces neiges sont cachées la moitié de l’année sous des nuages fort épais..... Malgré l’étonnement où cette effroyable solitude nous avoit jetté, nous ne laissons pas de chercher ces monastères dont Steuys..... n’est pas le seul qui a parlé; cependant on nous assura qu’il n’y avoit qu’un petit couvent abandonné, au pied de l’abîme.”—Tournefort, Voyage du Levant, vol. iii, Let. xix, p. 215-29.

His presence, and can no more approach Him with bloodless gifts. Would he propitiate the Deity? would he gain His favour? he must now build altars, and offer on them burnt sacrifices, the savour of which will rise up with their smoke, and bear up his prayers and wishes to the high and invisible God.

“And Noah took of every clean beast,” &c. That personality which we found so strongly marked in the acts and character of the Jewish Creator, here takes the form of caprice. Jehovah made—with the exception of man, who is their lord—all animals equal, and blessed them all. And now, without any sufficient reason for the preference, we find that his altars must be served with those animals only which are termed (no one knows wherefore) clean. Gradually we are prepared for all those nice distinctions of sacrificial meats which crowd the Jewish ceremonial, and, indeed, all old Pagan idolatries.¹

“And the Lord smelled a sweet savour.” However fondly we may dwell on the differences which separate the Jewish, from the Pagan, mind, those differences, in the early periods of history at least, are *formal* rather than *real*. And hence it is that, although the Jew owes fealty but to one God, while the Pagan pays homage to a thousand: that nevertheless they both so often agree as well in the acts and characters which they attribute, *the one* to his God, *the other* to his gods, as also in the mode of worship by which they both hope to gain the favour of the Deity. The same views, in a word, seem to my mind to pervade the same stages of civilization: and I am perhaps therefore sometimes too apt to *idolize* the Jewish Deity, who was indeed a *human*, but no *sensual*, God, when I find a parallel to his acts in, or would explain them by, those narrated of some Pagan demon. Thus, as I read that “the Lord smelled a sweet savour,” and then resolved not again to curse the ground for man’s sake, I am strongly reminded

¹ For some of the niceties attending pagan sacrifices, see Fourmont, *Anciens Peuples*, vol. i, p. 203; for those attending Jewish, the four last books of Moses, *passim*.

of the assurance which, in the *Odyssey*,² Mercury makes to Calypso, that not willingly did he traverse the vast and desert sea, where man has built no cities, and offers no sacrifices or choice hecatombs. And it then seems to me as if the words of this verse would express, that Jehovah too was weary of the vast solitude of the waters, and so rejoiced to breathe again the odour of sacrifice, that he gladly determined never more to destroy man from the face of the earth.

“Neither will I again smite any more every living thing as I have done.” Is this promise reconcileable with the Christian notion that the end of the world is at hand? Can the human race perish away by slow decay? Shall not “Be fruitful and multiply,” that oft-repeated injunction of the Deity, that one command which man has never ceased to fulfil, that great instinct of our nature, shall it not be ever stronger than, and always prevail against, the never-resting scythe of our terrible enemy Death? I believe so. But is the human race then eternal? I know not whence they are, but there are traditions which are prophecies, and which, like the voice of God, are heard in every corner of this great Paradise, the world: and they proclaim that the universe³ like ourselves must perish. While the earth remaineth, God will not any more smite man: the same destruction may, however, envelope both.

² Vide *Odys. η*, quoted (note ³, p. 142) chap. iv; and similarly in the *Metamorphoses*, when Jupiter declares his intention of destroying the earth by a deluge, though the gods assent—

“Est tamen humani generis jactura dolori

Omnibus: et quæ sit terræ, mortalibus orbæ

Forma futura rogant: quis sit laturus in aras

Thura?

Lib. i, verse 246.

And in Hindu mythology, when the sage Durvasas “pronounced that India and all the three worlds under his supremacy should be deprived of their *Sri*, or prosperity, the world in consequence fell into decay, sacrifices ceased, and the gods were enfeebled.” — Wilson, *Hind. Theat.* i, 82, note: comp. *Zend.* as above, note i, p. 109.

³ The limited duration of the world is an essential doctrine of the Hindu and old Persian creeds. Vide Wilford on the Nile, vol. v, p. 244, *Asiatic Researches*; Boun-Dehesch, *Zend.* vol. iii., and it was known even to the Greek and Roman religions, vide Ovid. *Metamor.* lib i.

Verse 22. This division of the seasons is a purely agricultural one. Seed-time and harvest, or spring and autumn, are the only two specified and definite divisions of the year: heat and cold, summer and winter, are only some indefinite spaces of time which lie between these two great epochs, these busy periods, in the life of the husbandman; and they are expressed consequently by terms which indicate, not activity and exertion, but patience, if not idleness.

By the way, Von Bohlen, in his "Alte Indien," somewhere objects to our narrative of the deluge, on the score of its year of three hundred and sixty days, which, he asserts, could not have been known at this early period. I too find it somewhat strange that the antediluvian men, who had so nicely observed the course of sun and stars that they had a year of twelve months of thirty days⁴ each, should nevertheless have been so negligent of the larger divisions of the year into seasons, as in reality to have but two, seed-time and harvest.⁵—But who can assert *a priori* the particular direction which civilization shall take? The Greeks were long without any true knowledge of the year,⁶ and yet Mexico at its discovery had a year of three hundred and sixty monthly, and five intercalary, days. The Otaheitans, too, built curiously carved canoes, and wove cloth, and mats, and were nevertheless ignorant that water could be made to boil. And the Peruvians similarly had constructed roads throughout their

⁴ One of the books of the Zend-avesta is the "Siruze," or Liturgical Calendar, as Kleuker calls it. Anquetil says that "Siruze" means thirty days; and the book is divided according to the thirty days of the months, but in fact it contains only twenty-nine days. Kleuker concludes, therefore, that there was a period when the Zend month was lunar and of twenty-nine days.—Vide Rhode, Heilige Sage des Zend Volks, p. 38.

⁵ "In China, Yao, who first settles the length of the year, which

he makes of 366 days, also orders a calendar to be made which shall point out the seasons: "et qui déterminât exactement le commencement de chacune des quatre saisons de l'année, afin que tout fût dans l'ordre."—Mémoires des Chinois, vol. iii, p. 225. It was in Yao's reign, too, that the great deluge happened which covered nearly the whole of China.

⁶ According to Herodotus, the Greeks borrowed their year from the Egyptians; vide lib. ii, c. iv.

dominions, and had established posts of communication between the several parts of their country and their capital; they had learned also to card and weave wool, and could work silver into vessels and tools, and would even occasionally mould it into images which prettily imitated nature:⁷ and yet the iron that was at their feet they had never observed, and knew not how to turn to account.⁸ When, therefore, we compare what the early nations are said at any given time to have known with that of which they remained in ignorance, we may often be surprised as well at the subtlety and ingenuity of their discoveries, as at the stupidity of their ignorance: but we cannot from their ignorance argue against their inventions.

Chapter ix. The Elohim blesses Noah and his sons as He before blessed Adam.

1st. He bids them replenish the earth, *i. e.*, He enjoins that sexual intercourse which has for its end the production of offspring.

2ndly. He delivers into their hands the whole animal creation: the fear of them is upon beast, and bird, and fish; the reign of love has ceased, the reign of fear has begun.

3rdly. He gives them every moving thing that liveth, to be for meat for them; but as when He gave Adam the fruits of every tree in Eden for food, He specially excluded the fruit of the tree of knowledge; so now, when He permits man to eat of all living creatures, He at the same time forbids him "to eat the blood thereof, which is the life thereof."

⁷ "Ce jardin.....étoit du tems des Yncas tout d'or et d'argent, comme ceux qu'on voyoit dans les palais de leurs rois, où il y avoit en or quantité d'herbes, de fleurs, de plantes et d'arbres de diverses sortes, comme aussi plusieurs animaux grands et petits, &c.....Là même étoient représentés au naturel, et mis en leur place.....des

papillons et des oiseaux de toutes les sortes pour l'embellissement de ce lieu."—*Histoire des Yncas*, lib. iii, c. xxiv.

⁸ "Ils avoient plusieurs mines de fer, mais ils ne le savoient pas tirer, &c."—*Vide Histoire des Yncas*, par Garcilasso de la Vega, vol. i, p. 120.

“Even as the green herb have I given you all things.” There is no animal however disgusting, which the necessities or the gluttony of some nations does not, even in our day, render palatable. Thus the aborigines of New South Wales will eat all sorts of reptiles.⁹ And the nomadic or mountain races of India, according to Dubois,¹ eagerly devour any flesh except that of the cow; foxes, cats, rats, serpents, &c., are all equally welcome to them. The native Americans too, Lafitau² informs us, will eat of every thing, and find every thing good; and Robertson³ mentions that they are sometimes compelled to feed on spiders, eggs of ants, lizards, serpents, various reptiles of odious forms, and a kind of unctuous earth. But even among more civilized people we not unfrequently find that some sorts of flesh are considered edible, from which our own countrymen generally would turn away with disgust: thus the Egyptians willingly eat of the locust, the Tartar tribes of the field mouse,⁴ the Arabs of the camel, and the South Americans of the horse; and in China puppies, in Italy one sort of snails, and in France frogs, are severally esteemed delicacies. *A foolish and self-conceited nation*, which sees other people, and those no way in the rear of civilization, thus gladly turning to use, and finding nourishment, in meats which it regards as an abomination, will no doubt swell with pride at the pleasing contemplation of its own superior niceness and purity; *a wise one* will begin to consider whether or not its catalogue of edible animals is not too exclusive, and whether it has not rejected from its tables many kinds of wholesome and palatable food, and thus unnecessarily restricted its means of subsistence.

“But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.” As a necessary consequence of

⁹ Vide supra, note ², p. 92.

¹ Dubois, Mœurs des Indes, part. i, c. v.

² La nécessité les oblige à manger de tout sans discernement, et à trouver tout bon,” &c.—Lafitau,

Mœurs des Sauvages, vol. ii, p. 91, 92.

³ Robertson’s America, book iv.

⁴ Pallas, Reisen durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reichs, vol. iii, p. 348.

this injunction, flesh cannot be eaten until it has been prepared by fire. That originally flesh was eaten raw, that before the discovery of fire it must commonly⁵ have been so eaten, if it were eaten at all, there is little doubt. But even after the properties of fire were known, there are several reasons which would retard the universal application of it to flesh as an article of food.

1st. The habit of eating raw flesh had rendered it palatable,⁶ and compared with the high flavour of the hot blood, baked meats doubtless tasted tame and mawkish.

2ndly. The time and trouble⁷ which are necessary to prepare flesh by fire would little suit the voracious and impatient appetites for which all savages are remarkable.⁸ Not until man began to make provision, and to have set and appointed times for eating, could cooked flesh come into general use.⁹ And

⁵ Some nations, however, eat their food after drying it in the sun: "Agathareide, Arrien, Diodore, Strabon, Pline, et même des relations modernes, parlent de nations qui n'avoient point d'autre manière de cuire leur nourriture, que de l'exposer aux rayons du soleil."—Goguet, *Origine des Loix*, lib. ii, p. 76.

⁶ In the *Recueil des Voyages Holland.* vol. i, p. 597, is an account of the dinner of a savage of the coast of South America off Penguin Island: "*Comme elle ne vouloit point manger de viande cuite*, on lui donna des oiseaux qui étoient dans les canots, qu'elle prit, et en ayant tiré les plus grandes plumes, elle les ouvrit avec des coquilles.....Ensuite elle les vida, et jetta le fiel, les entrailles, et le cœur, mais elle passa le foie sur le feu et le mangea encore si cru, que le sang en couloit le long de ses lèvres.....Les autres parties du corps, elle les déchira de ses dents, en sorte que le sang lui couloit sur le sein. Les enfans firent de même, et mangèrent des oiseaux tout

crus." The Samojedes eat fish always, and flesh often, raw.—*Histoire Générale des Voyages* xviii, 504. "Les Ostiacks paroissent faire grand cas du sang chaud de quelque animal que ce soit."—*Id.* p. 515.

⁷ Vide an enumeration of some of the long and tedious expedients to which savage nations have recourse for cooking their meat, in Goguet, *ut supra*, *Origine des Loix*, p. 76-7.

⁸ *e. g.* The example of Saul's soldiers after their victory at Michmash.—*Sam.* xiv.

⁹ I have no distinct authority for this, but it is consonant with reason, and I find that among wandering tribes raw flesh is not unfrequently eaten. Thus Burckhardt, of the nomad tribes in Syria, tells us that among them "the livers and lungs of all animals are usually eaten raw" (*Syria*, p. 592): of those of Nubia, "that the Busharaje, who rarely descend from the mountains, live entirely upon flesh and milk, eating much of the former raw. According to the Nubians, they are very fond of the blood of

3rdly. The introduction of cooked meats would be opposed by those who, mistaking ferocity for courage, would insist that raw flesh gave strength, hardihood, and all other manly virtues.¹

“The blood thereof, which is the life thereof.” “One day at Borneo, being indisposed, Captain Beckman ordered the surgeon to bleed him. Cay Deponatte, a native, with several others, being present, and strangers to the operation, were in great amazement to know what we were about, till at length the vein being opened they saw the blood gush out; on this they were so frightened that they immediately ran out of the room, crying out, “Oran gela attee,” *i. e.*, “the man’s heart or mind is foolish;” after which they told us that we let out “*our very souls and lives willingly.*”

By the way, *in the second chapter*, Jehovah Elohim breathes into man’s nostrils and the plastic clay becomes a living soul. The life then of the man made by Jehovah Elohim, and made of the dust of the ground, seems to have been in the breath; *according to this passage*, however, the life of the man made by the Elohim, and made in His image, is in the blood. Surely between these two accounts of that which constitutes our life there is a discrepancy which cannot easily be removed;³ both may be wrong, but both scarcely can be right.

slaughtered sheep; but their greatest luxury is said to be the raw marrow of the camel.” (Nubia, p. 128.) The Esquimaux, too, when at a distance from their dwellings, will eat game and fish raw. Vide De Pauw, Americans, part iii, § 10, p. 262.

¹ Thus the giant Starchaterus (of Denmark) when asked to a feast, where well-baked meats did furnish forth the festal tables, “Ut Danicum luxum, Tentonum ritum (unde effeminati fierent) introductum, averteret, inter alia patrio carmine, multis dimissis, sic cecinit,

“Fortium crudus cibus est virorum :

Nec reor lantis opus esse mensis

Mens quibus belli meditatur usum

Pectore forti.”—Olaus Magnus, De Gent. Septen.

² From a collection called “The Portfolio,” p. 156.

³ Yet in chap. vi. 17, the Elohim recognises the breath as the life. The Greeks seem to have had the

same double view of the vital principle; sometimes the soul, *αμειβεται ἔρκος οδοντων* (Il. ix, 409); and sometimes *κατ’ οὐταμένην ὠτείλην ἐσσυτ’ ἐπειγομένη*.—Il. xiv. 519.

Verses 5 & 6. The Elohim proceeds to warn Noah that henceforward manslaughter shall be punished.⁴ The reasoning on which this law is based seems to be the following: Because the blood is the life, and the life is God's, though you have permission to kill the animal and eat it, you shall respect its blood, *i. e.*, its life, which belongs to God.⁵ But not merely man's blood, *i. e.*, his life, is God's, but his body also is made in God's image, and that image therefore you shall not desecrate by shedding man's blood, under the penalty of yourself losing your own blood, *i. e.*, your own life;—or in other words, because God's image has been desecrated in one case, therefore it shall be desecrated in another—an absurd conclusion enough, though one to which the last clause of verse 6, containing the reason of the law, “for in the image of God made he man,”⁶ can only apply.

Man and beast are, it will be observed, included in this penal law. This law, then, punishes *an act*, bloodshedding, and *not a crime*, murder. And this first and simple code, which the Elohim promulgates among mankind, consists,

1st. Of a law which, however useful it may have proved as a means of civilization, is not, considered in itself, a moral law, *i. e.* a law, the observance of which is of universal obligation. And,

⁴ Vide supra, p. 62.

⁵ The relation of Moses is at least consistent with itself. There is no government, and the murdered man must be avenged by his nearest relation. Not so the Chinese books; there is a government, a judicature, a public opinion, it seems; and yet of homicide the law takes no cognizance, it leaves its punishment to the family: “Sous le règne de Chun, dit Ouen-ty, un bonnet coloré, des habits extraordinaires, étaient la punition des coupables; le peuple intimidé, n’osait violer la loi. Et maintenant que la loi condamne aux supplices, les crimes ne tarissent pas.”.....“La loi ne se

chargeoit pas de la punition des homicides; parcequ’elle croyoit les empêcher plus efficacement, en laissant ce soin à ceux qui étaient plus intéressés à les venger, la partie publique pouvant être réduite ou désarmée par l’intérêt de l’état.”—Sur l’antiquité des Chinois, Mémoires des Chinois, vol. i, p. 181; and compare Des Guignes, Chou-king, c. v, p. 38.

⁶ Do not these words again show us that the image of Adam, which was the image of God, was not merely continued to man through Seth, but still ennobles Adam’s post-diluvian descendants?

2ndly. Of a law which severally confounds together, under the same categories, *first*, men and beasts, beings dissimilar in kind; and, *secondly*, murder and manslaughter, acts, in a moral view, essentially different one from the other.

Again, these two laws, which are both prohibitions, differ one from the other, in that the first has no punishment affixed to it, while the second is sanctioned by a *lex talionis*. The first law, then, is imperfect; and its imperfection we may conjecturally account for in several ways. We may suppose,

1st. That the horror of blood was a feeling so general, that the law was no way likely to be transgressed, and was, indeed, intended rather to account for that horror, than to induce it.

Or, 2ndly. That the eating of blood was a custom so prevalent, that the legislator, while he wished to discourage, dared not punish it.⁸

Or, 3rdly. That because there was no judicature, and because all crimes against the person, all injuries, were punished, not by judges, but by the person himself, or his relations, and punished by retaliation:⁹ and as this eating of blood was an offence against God, and one to which no *lex talionis* was applicable: that therefore to God also was left the punishment, and the degree of punishment with which it should be visited.¹

⁷ With this notion much that is related in this early history is consistent. Thus the creation *accounts* for the sanctification of the Sabbath; God's command, for the animal instinct to propagate the species, for the eating of flesh, &c. Against this conjecture, however, we have the example of many nations eating blood, and among these also some nomadic people; vide note ⁹, p. 215.

⁸ We may insist upon the fact that blood is still eaten and was frequently eaten by the nations neighbours to the Jews, &c., but the law would then suppose a priest-

class striving to civilize a ruder race, and giving to their laws, as will all priest-classes, the authority of the Divinity; vide *supra*, p. 148.

⁹ For the extent to which the spirit of retaliation in the punishment of all sorts of offences is carried by the Arabs, see Burckhardt, *Manners of the Arabians*. Mahomet extends it to the next world. The brutes are called up merely to take vengeance of one another, and are then changed into dust. Vide Sale's *Koran*, Prelim. Dis. p. 129.

¹ Similarly to the Deity is left in all religions the punishment of perjury.

Verses 8-17. This is finely imagined. Man lands upon the wrecked earth weak and helpless; he trembles now at every cloud; and, occupied in providing against some coming deluge, he neglects every art of life: he lives from day to day: he has not courage to cultivate the earth: rapidly he is falling back to his old ignorance and pristine barbarism, when suddenly the Elohim appears, and makes his covenant with Noah, and sets his bow in the heavens, strengthening men's hearts with the assurance that never again shall flood destroy the earth.

A great deal has been said and written to show that, as the rainbow is but a refraction of the rays of light upon a cloud, so long as the sun has existed, and clouds have obscured the heaven, so long rainbows must have been seen. Be it so. This also is but another of those myths which, while it accounts for, gives a new interest to, physical phenomena, by knitting them to the past fate and fortunes of mankind.²

On a first perusal of this story of the deluge, we are struck by the seemingly unnecessary frequency of the repetitions, and the also seemingly indiscriminate use of the names Jehovah and Elohim, as applied to the Deity. When, however, we more carefully examine and analyze the narrative, we begin to perceive that its repetitions are intimately connected with these two names of the Jewish God; that, in fact, this story of the deluge, as it appears in Genesis, is composed of two narrations of the same event; *the one* of which recognizes the Deity as Jehovah, *the other* as Elohim.

The wickedness of man is observed upon by

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vi. 5. "And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."³

ELOHIM.

Chap. vi. 12. "And the Elohim looked upon the earth and behold it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth."

² Homer, too, calls the rainbow *τρεας...ανθρωπων*. Il. xi. 28, xvii. 546; and see Heyne in h. 1.

³ This, in our Bible an Elohim verse, is by Eichorn given to Jehovah.

Judgment is pronounced on man by

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vi. 7. "And Jehovah said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth, both man and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them."

ELOHIM.

Chap. vi. 13. "And the Elohim said unto Noah, the end of all flesh is come before me, for the earth is filled with violence through them, and behold I will destroy them with the earth."

The purity of Noah is recognised by

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vi. 8. "But Noah found grace in the eyes of Jehovah;" and chap. vii. 1. "And Jehovah said unto Noah, Thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation."

ELOHIM.

Chap. vi. 9. "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God."

A flood is threatened by

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vii. 1. "For yet seven days and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights, and every living substance that I have made will I destroy from off the face of the earth."

ELOHIM.

Chap. vi. 17. "And behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh wherein is the breath of life from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth shall die."

Noah is ordered to gather living things into a ship by

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vii. 1. "Come thou and all thy house into the ark...2. Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female: and of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and his female: of fowls also of the air by sevens, the male and the female; to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth."

ELOHIM.

Chap. vi. 18. "Thou shalt come into the ark; thou and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee; and of every living thing of all flesh; two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee, they shall be male and female: of fowls after their kind, and cattle after their kind, and of every creeping thing after his kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee to keep them alive."

Noah obeys.

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vii. 5. "And Noah did according unto all that Jehovah commanded him."

ELOHIM.

Chap. vi. 22. "Thus did Noah according to all that the Elohim commanded him."

Noah's age at the flood according to

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vii. 6. "And Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters was upon the earth."

ELOHIM.

Chap. vii. 11. "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened."

Noah enters the ark, and gathers into it all living things according to

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vii. 7. "And Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him into the ark, because of the waters of the flood: of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of every thing that creepeth upon the earth, there went in two and two unto Noah into the ark, the male and the female.

ELOHIM.

Chap. vii. 13. "In the self-same day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them into the ark; they, and every beast after his kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind, and every fowl after his kind, and every bird of every sort; and they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life; and they that went in went in male and female of all flesh."

The flood is upon the earth and prevails according to

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vii. 17 and (19?) "And the flood was forty days upon the earth: and the waters increased and bare up the ark, and it was lift up above the earth—and the waters prevailed exceedingly above the earth; and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered."³

ELOHIM.

Chap. vii. 12 & 17. "And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights, and the waters prevailed and were increased greatly upon the earth, and the ark went upon the face of the waters: fifteen cubits upwards did the waters prevail, and the mountains were covered."

³ Eichhorn regards this, though with some hesitation, as a Jehovah verse. For me, who know no Hebrew, to have an opinion is absurd, yet as the expression "under the

heaven" belongs to the undoubtedly Elohim portion of Genesis (chap. vi. 17), why not regard this also as an Elohim, and the 18th as a Jehovah verse?

All living things perish according to

JEHOVAH.

Chap. vii. 23. "And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping thing, and the fowl of the heaven, and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive and they that were with him in the ark."

ELOHIM.

Chap. vii. 21 & 22. "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man; all in whose nostrils was the breath of life of all that was in the dry land died."

That man shall not again perish promised by

JEHOVAH.

Chap. viii. 21. "And Jehovah said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake;.....While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, cold and heat, &c..., shall not cease.

ELOHIM.

Chap. ix. 8. "And the Elohim spake unto Noah...saying...I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood: neither shall there be any more a flood to destroy the earth; and the Elohim said, This is the token of the covenant which I make.....I do set my bow in the cloud," &c.

In these two narratives, similar as they undoubtedly are in their great leading features, we may, nevertheless, discover some little peculiarities of thought and expression which distinguish them one from the other. For instance,

I. Jehovah's determinations are expressed in conversations with himself (as vi. 3, 6-7; viii. 21): the Elohim's in conversations with Noah (vi. 13; ix. 1-17).

II. By Jehovah all animals are divided into clean and unclean; and, according as they are one or the other, they are to be taken by sevens or by twos into the ark. By the Elohim, the animal creation is sorted according to its kinds, and no one kind is more favoured than the other; of every kind a pair only is to be preserved. (Compare chap. vii. 2, 3, 4, and 8, 9 verses, with chap. vi. 19, 20, and vii. 14, 15 verses).

And III. The Jehovah narrative concludes with a sacrifice, but knows of no covenant; the Elohim, on the other hand, concludes with a covenant, but is altogether igno-

rant of a sacrifice. And each of these conclusions seems to me to accord well with the whole tenor of the narrative to which it belongs. *Jehovah*, when he fills the ark with *clean beasts*, prepares us for the savour of sacrifice; but neither in the solitude of His councils, nor in the bitterness of His repentance, nay, nor even in the tone of His address to Noah, can we read any hope that he will ever do more than *endure* mankind.⁴ Not so the Elohim. He makes, indeed, no provision of *clean beasts*: and no sacrifice therefore can be offered to Him, save at the expense of some race or species of animal, for the very preservation of which the ark was constructed; but His kind and parental tone, and His own spontaneous and solemn promise,⁵ guarantee to us that He will not leave man trembling and helpless, but that He will comfort him by assurances of protection and support.

And iv. Each of these narratives is distinguished by the same peculiarities as those other portions of Genesis which recognize the Deity under the same name. Thus, as in some preceding chapters of *Jehovah* we noticed a decided predilection for etymologies, a certain fondness for plays upon words, so here, in the twenty-first verse of the eighth chapter, the words "the Lord smelled a sweet savour," or "a savour of rest" (*nuach*), seem to be an etymology of, or pun on, the name of Noah.⁶ As, too, in his genealogies, the *Jehovah* author attached to each name the inventions for which its possessor deserved to be remembered; so now, by his classification of beasts into clean and unclean, and by his description of the sacrifice of Noah, so different in every particular from the offerings of Cain and Abel, and, *lastly*, by his division of the year into seasons, he goes on, incidentally indeed, marking the improvements of society, and the progress of civilization.

Similarly the Elohim narrative of the deluge accords with the other Elohim portions of Genesis. Compared with the Elohim genealogies, it uses the same terms to

⁴ Vide chap. vi. 3, 5; and compare chap. viii. 27, &c.

⁵ Vide chap. vi. 18.

⁶ Vide *supra*, p. 159.

express holiness, — like Enoch, Noah walks with God. Compared with the Elohim creation, we find it, like that creation, designating all animals, as beasts after their kind, and cattle after their kind; like that creation, too, it pronounces on all living things the blessing, “be fruitful and multiply;” and, like that creation, it gives man dominion, and chooses for him his food, permitting him to eat, without any distinction of meats, “of every moving thing that liveth.”

With the first verses of the sixth chapter, we may connect those of the laws of Moses which are based upon the principle that things unlike are not to be mixed together, i. e. those laws which forbid all intermarriage with strange nations (Exod. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 3, 4, &c.); those laws which punish all unnatural crimes (Levit. xviii. 22, and xx. 5); and those laws which prohibit, first, the bringing of diverse kinds of cattle together for purposes either of generation (Levit. xix. 19) or of husbandry (Deut. xxiv. 10); and, secondly, the wearing of garments of divers stuffs; and, thirdly, the sowing the same field with divers seeds (Deut. xxii. 9 and 11).

In the deluge, considered as the punishment of crime, and in the preservation of Noah and the reasons given for it, we have the first great exemplifications of the Jewish notions of God’s providence as shown in the government of the world, and exemplifications which every subsequent page of Jewish history is made to corroborate.

In the reasons given by Jehovah for not again destroying the earth, we have the first notice that sin and crime are now something natural to, innate in, man.

As exemplifying the strictness with which the law against blood-eating was observed by the Jews, we may note: the anxiety of Saul to expiate the crime of which his army was guilty in breaking this law after their victory over the Philistines at Michmash (vide 1 Sam. xiv. 30, &c.): the refusal of David to drink of the water which, at the peril of their lives, three of his mighty men obtain from the well at Bethlehem (2 Sam. xxiii. 17): and the name of

horror, given to the potter's field, which was purchased with the price of Christ's blood. (Matth. xxvii. 4.)

In the directions for the ark, which the Elohim gives to Noah, we see the Deity who is hereafter to plan and overlook the building of His own tabernacle, or Holy of Holies. (Vide Exod. xxxvi. 5, and xxxix. 5; &c.)

In the division of beasts into clean and unclean, and in the sacrifice of Noah, we find the germs of the whole sacrificial law. (Vide Levit. passim.)

In the prohibition to eat blood, we may discover the first germ of all the laws regarding meats.

In the law against, or punishing manslaughter, we find the principle of the whole Mosaical penal code. (Exod. xxi. 24; xxii. 1.)

And in the covenant which the Elohim here makes with Noah, we see the first of those many covenants in which the Deity hereafter assures the greatness of the Abrahamic race.

CHAPTER VII.

GENESIS ix. 18-29.

Chapter ix. verse 20: Noah,⁷ the contemplative Noah, prosecutes and improves the arts of the Cainite race. He walks now on the green sward of the new world, observant, thoughtful. He has tasted of the wild grape; he has observed that its fruit, even when dried, is still pleasant to the taste, and not without nourishment. He collects therefore numerous vines, and plants them around his home, and gathers their fruit, and extracts and preserves the juice, which in time ferments and becomes wine.

The art of extracting and preparing some intoxicating liquor from roots, grains, fruit, or milk, is one known and practised by almost every nation,⁸ however ignorant and barbarous. These several liquors, which may be comprised under the general names of wine, beer, and spirits, are found as habitual beverages considerably to influence the moral character of the several people which make use of them. Thus every day experience and the testimony of all travellers prove, that the populations of beer and spirit countries are in general addicted to drunkenness, while those of wine are sober, gay, and social. Beer and spirits then, (*the one*, because it stupifies the understanding, *the other*, because it irritates the nerves and inflames the

⁷ The invention of wine I here give to Noah—following the received opinion—the text is doubtful; it is attributed by the Egyptians to the second Osiris (Diod. Sic. lib. i, § xv), by the Greeks to Bacchus, by the Italians to Saturn, by the Chinese to Y-ti; in the reign

of Yu, Y-ti was banished for his pains.—Chine, by Du Halde, vol. i, p. 80.

⁸ The only people I can remember, who seem to be without any prepared fermented or spirituous beverage, are the inhabitants of Australia and Terra del Fuego.

passions), if they do not tend to brutalize a people, at least induce habits which are adverse to the habits of civilization. Wine, on the other hand, cheers the heart, and refreshes and invigorates the intellect, and enhances the allowed pleasures of life: it has therefore a humanizing tendency.

Noah drinks of the wine till he is drunken. This little episode is not told to the disparagement of Noah, and no way impugns his former holiness—not however because he drank the wine, unconscious of the effect it would have upon him,⁹—but because the religion of Moses is altogether anti-ascetic in its spirit: witness Isaac's blessing of Jacob, (Gen. xxvii. 28), the numerous descriptions of Canaan, (Books of Moses *passim*), and the apologue of Gotham (Judges ix. 13); and see also the Prov. xxxi. and Isaiah xxv. 6; and Deut. xii. 7. 18; xiv. 26; xxvi. 11; and compare xxi. 20, &c.¹ The same anti-ascetic tendencies, we may presume, belong also to the Zend creed.

1st. Because the Zendavesta contains no dietary precepts; and

2dly. Because the propagation of domestic animals, and the cultivation of the earth, are the most meritorious of the services which Ormuzd demands of his worshippers.²

In this respect, then, the creeds of Moses and Zoroaster favourably distinguish themselves from the religion of the Vedas, which enjoins long penance and severe mortifications, as the surest means of doing God service; and which finds a holy virtue in roots and the hard ground, *i. e.* poverty and sloth; which luscious fruits and healthful

⁹ So Michaelis, Comment.; Hoffman, Heb. Alterthüm. But if error be pardonable, how is it that the man who accidentally kills another must die? and why, when the oxen shake the ark of the Lord, and Uzzah puts forth his hand to steady it, does "God smite him for his error"?—2 Sam. vi.

¹ Hoffman, Heb. Alterthüm. p. 464, says that the Hebrew word for a feast is properly "a drinking bout."

² Zendavesta, vol. i, Fargard iii, p. 279, 284; and see also an account of the life and deeds of the pure Djemschid (Farg. ii, p. 271), and the close of the "Nekah," or nuptial benediction (vol. ii, p. 98). I find that Anquetil (Syst. Théol. de Zoroastre) confirms this view; he says expressly that fasting is forbidden to the Parsi (vol. ii, p. 601).

meats, and beds of purple, *i. e.* industry and elegance, can never give.³

Verse 21. Among nomadic people, even in this our day, the chief, or father of the tribe, is held in great reverence. In the earliest times, he was king, priest, and prophet.⁴ In him resided all power; his words were law; he stood before his children in God's place. The sanctity of his person none dared to violate. His authority, and reverence for his authority, were the conditions, which alone made the family state possible. Any insult to his age, therefore, any act which might draw down contempt upon his character, was a crime of deep dye. Hence to Moses and his people, the conduct of Ham,—in our eyes it merits at the most but a rebuke,—is a treason, a rebellion, which like the disobedience of Adam, indicates a taint in the blood, and like it therefore must be punished through interminable generations.

The once supreme authority of the parent we may trace in the laws and customs of several of the ancient nations. Thus in India,⁵ where the sole expounders of the Vedas, the Brahmins, have transferred to themselves, as *spiritual*

³ See Institutes of Menu, c. vi, On Devotion. The instruction to the Brahmen "who has read the Vedas, legally begotten a son, and has performed sacrifices," *i. e.*, who has paid his three debts,—how to apply his heart to eternal bliss.

⁴ "Dovettere i Padri eroi..... essere nello stato che dicesi di natura, i sapienti in sapienza d'auspicj o sia sapienza volgare; e 'n seguito di cotal sapienza esser i sacerdoti che, come più degni, dovevano sacrificare, per procurare o sia ben intendergli auspicj; e finalmente li re, che dovevano portar le leggi degli Dei a le loro famiglie."—Vico Scienza Nuova, lib. secon. p. 270; and see also *id.* Dignità lxxii, iii, iv, v.

⁵ Vide Institutes of Menu, § 251, C. Private Morals: "The child is

bound to maintain his natural and spiritual parents;" and C. Education, § 135: "The student must consider a Brahmin, though but ten years old, and a Shasthya, though aged 100 years, as father and son, as between these two the young Brahmin is to be respected as the father.....§ 146. "Of him who gives natural birth, and him who gives knowledge of the whole Veda, the giver of sacred knowledge is the more venerable father;" also § 150-1; and for the respect paid to preceptors, vide § 194, 201; and also Act iii. of "Midra Rakshasa," in Wilson's Hindu Theatre. For the practical working of these laws I refer to Dubois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. i, p. 422.

fathers, that respect and veneration which elsewhere is the due of the natural parents; even in India, the parent may still sell his children to strangers,⁶ and has still a claim upon them for maintenance. And in Greece,⁷ where the state early interfered with, and limited the authority of the father, and gave its protection to the child till it conferred on him, when arrived at the age of manhood, the dignity of citizenship: in Greece, we find the father, though prevented by an express law from disposing of his children's liberty,⁸ still invested with the power of pronouncing at their births on their life or death:⁹ and in Greece, moreover, though we hear little of the duties of parents, we see those of children sanctioned by the gods and inculcated in many a terrible legend.¹ In ancient Persia, the child up to a certain age, owed to his parents unlimited obedience, and the child that thrice answered his father or mother, was considered worthy of death.² In Rome,³ and here the paternal authority appears as absolute, the father was lord of his household; his children were his natural slaves; he had power over their lives and property, and was accountable to none for the use he made of that power. In China,⁴ we find the same family despotism as in

⁶ Forbes, *Oriental Memoirs*, vol. i, p. 251, 252.

⁷ Hermann, *Political Antiquities of Greece*, § 122, 123; Bekker *Charikles*, Append. c. i, üb. *Erziehung d. Knaben*.

⁸ Solon took away this power. Vide Titman, *Græcis. Staatsverfas.* p. 12.

⁹ Potter, *Antiq. of Greece*, vol. ii, p. 326; Bekker, *ut supra*. The father must decide on the life of the child before it is six days old.

¹ As in the laws of Triptolemus, engraved on the walls of Eleusis (Creuzer, *Symbolik*, vol. iv. p. 122); as in the legends Theseus, Œdipus, Orestes, and others, adduced by Plato, *De Legibus*, xi, from Potter.

² "L'enfant doit à ses parens une soumission absolue. Celui qui

répond trois fois à son père ou sa mère, et ne leur obéit pas, est digne de mort."—Anquetil, *du Perron's Usages des Perses*, Zend, vol. ii, p. 552. After the child became a Behdin, he, however, seems to have been emancipated.—Id. p. 554.

³ By the law of the twelve tables: "Paterfamilias jus vitæ et necis in liberos esto;" and again: "Quicquid filius acquirit, patri acquirit;" and see Michelet, *Hist. Rom.* vol. i, p. 97.

⁴ "C'est sur le respect qu'on doit aux parens et aux maîtres que les Chinois ont principalement établi les fondemens de leur moral et de leur politique..... Les loix donnent aux pères un pouvoir absolu sur leurs familles, ils ont même le droit de vendre leurs enfans à des

Rome. But in Rome this ^{disposition}~~disposition~~, though recognized by the laws, does not seem, except in so far as its tendencies were aristocratic, to have had influence on the government or constitution of the state; while in China it is the basis of all civil and religious morality, and the model on which the state is framed. In the Judaical books, the child is regarded as the property of his parents; he may be sold for their benefit, and mortgaged for their debts:⁵ and though Deut. xxi. limits the power of the father, it limits that power so slightly, that with the legends of Abraham and Jephtha before us, we may fairly conclude that it once extended even over the life of the child.

Again, as in China, so in the Mosaical books, the religion and the laws delivered to the people, are delivered to them as the laws and the religion of their fathers. Filial piety—displayed in a reverential love for their great common parents, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, from whom they hold their God and their right to their country,—is among the great bonds which make of the twelve tribes one nation. But if the Israelites loved to dwell upon the memory of their great ancestors, they were at the same time taught to look forward to their own posterity.⁶ With the very name of their first father, Abraham, was associated the promise of Him in whom all the families of the earth should be blessed. They therefore lived not in the past only, but in the future also. In China, however, man's

étrangers s'ils sont mécontents de leur conduite.....Un père qui accuse un fils devant le Mandarin de quelque manquement à son égard, n'a pas besoin de preuves, le fils de là est coupable, et le père a toujours raison (compare Deuter. xxi. 18, &c.).....Si un enfant s'empporte jusqu'à dire des injures à son père, ou même, si transporté de fureur, il vient à le frapper, ou à lui ôter la vie, un pareil crime met toute la province en alarme, on punit ses proches, on dépose souvent le Mandarin," &c.—Du Halde, Chine, vol. iii, p. 155, &c.

⁵ Vide Nehemiah v. and Deuter. xxi. 18. With these we may compare Plato, De Legibus, § xi, p. 153, where he treats of the differences which sometimes arise between parents and children.

⁶ The Zend, in the nuptial benediction, or "Nekah," makes it the man's duty to excel his father: "Rendez-vous plus célèbre que votre père."—Vol ii, p. 97. There is more of the spirit of modern society in these words than in any I remember in the other old religions.

duties are not merely based upon, but comprehended under, filial piety. In China, consequently, he clings, or is chained, to the tomb of his fathers.⁷ In their steps it is his desire to walk, and not himself to invent, but to imitate the ancients; and to equal not to improve upon them, is the ambition of the virtuous sage. Hence a literature which is confined to history,⁸ and a virtue, a science, and a grief,⁹ which are erudite.

Again, the Jewish lawgiver, while he enforces the duties of filial piety, limits their duration. "A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." So soon as he married, the wandering patriarch seems to have inhabited his own tent, and to have been lord of his own family; and though he may have continued to travel in the company, and perhaps as a follower, of his father,¹ he seems to have been no way subject to the paternal authority. With the years, he took upon himself the offices, of manhood, and claimed the right of independent act and independent thought; and while he doubtless respected his father's opinion, loved, honoured him, he ceased to make his father's will his law. Not so the Chinese son. So long as his parents live, he is a child. The duties of a husband and a father must yield

⁷ "Quand un lettré veut quitter sa patrie, on tâche de l'en détourner en lui disant, Quoi! vous abandonneriez les tombeaux de vos ancêtres?"—Mémoires des Chinois, vol. iv. p. 10.

⁸ "Ne nous hazardez jamais," says Confucius, in his "Hia-king," "à rien dire qui ne soit conforme aux loix que les anciens empereurs ont fait; et n'osez rien faire dont leurs vertus ne vous ait donné l'exemple."—Id. p. 33; and see the accusation preferred against Ouang-si-heou, id. vol. xv. p. 287.

⁹ "Le sage, dit Confucius, se possède assez lui-même dans l'ivresse de la douleur pour que sa

manière même de pleurer puisse être imitée."—Id. p. 13, and see Doctrine des Chinois sur la Piété Filiale, in same note.

¹ Thus, Abram travelled some time with his father Terah, but seems soon to have parted company with him (Gen. xii. 1). Isaac also, at his marriage, dwelt alone in the south country. Jacob and Esau must have been both of them independent of their father. Simeon and Levi of their own motion slay the men of Shechem; and Judah, without consulting Jacob, condemns his daughter-in-law Tamar to death, &c.

before those which he owes as a son:² his place it is to obey. So the lawgivers have ordered it. God, however, has ordered otherwise; and though *His* laws are protected neither by the whip nor the bowstring, sure and terrible is the punishment which waits upon all violation of them.³ In China, then, man compelled by law to sacrifice his self-independence, binds down his nature by numerous ceremonies to an hypocritical mildness; he makes himself a living lie; he becomes selfish, and sensual, and cruel,—anything so long only as he maintains the decency of appearances, and violates not that conventional politeness which is the alpha and omega of Chinese society.

Verses 24 and 25. The first murder on record is a fratricide, and the first human curse is the curse of a father on his son. Created man's first crime was one of disobedience, disobedience against his Maker; post-diluvian man's one of disrespect, disrespect of a child towards his father. In both cases the offended party pronounces sentence on the criminal. *In the one case*, Adam is condemned to return to the dust of which he was made; *in the other*, Canaan is punished with a life of servitude; and in both cases about 930 years elapse ere either of the sentences are fulfilled.

"Cursed be Canaan!" Commentators terrified at the injustice of this curse, have supposed—

1. That the text was corrupt; that the words should stand thus, "Cursed be Ham, the father of Canaan!"⁴ But if we inquire of them why Ham is especially called the father of Canaan, and not rather the father of Cush; their

² "Un fils doit répudier une femme qu'il aime dès qu'elle déplaît à son père et à sa mère, et garder toute sa vie celle pour qu'il a de l'aversion dès qu'elle est à leur gré" (Mém. des Chinois, p. 288); and again: "La loi veut qu'un fils ne regarde plus comme sa mère celle qui lui a donné le jour, lorsqu'elle a été répudiée par son père, et surtout lorsqu'elle ne veut pas

garder la viduité, et qu'elle se remarie."—Id.

³ Hence the necessity of studying history, of looking at nations through their laws, creeds, &c. and observing how far these influence their character. History thus studied is the great book of God's providence, which gradually opens to us the laws of God to man.

⁴ Vide Michael. Com. ad h. l., &c.

answer, it is evident, will be, because in Canaan's race the curse was to be fulfilled.⁵ This emendation consequently unsupported by any authority, and which must be applied to three several verses, is an emendation in seeming only, —it leaves the justice of the case just where it found it.

II. That Ham was cursed in Canaan, because Canaan was his favourite son. How these commentators have ascertained that Canaan was the favourite of Ham, I know not; but this I know, that *they* can have but strange ideas of justice, who punish the father through his innocent children. And yet these very men, who thus endeavour to excuse the curse of Noah, because they believe that God has sanctioned it, abhor the similar sentence of Gesler as a cruel tyranny. Such and so consequent is man.

III. That Canaan was cursed, because he stood by and mocked his grandfather's nakedness. No trace of this is to be found in the tale. And were it all there, still would it no way account for the justice of a sentence which took effect, not upon the criminal, but upon his descendants, in the tenth generation.

Shall we say, then, that Canaan was unjustly cursed? Yes, the men of our age will unhesitatingly answer. But how would have answered Moses? The very fact that this curse is recorded in a sacred book, that it proceeds from the mouth of a pious patriarch, and that its fulfilment is left to God's providence,⁶ proves that, in the eyes of the

⁵ In Africa (the great slave quarry of the European race) we find traditions which account for the origin of slavery: "Ils souviennent," according to Bosman, "que dans l'origine Dieu créa des blancs et des nègres; qu'après avoir considéré son ouvrage, il fit deux présens à ses deux créatures, l'or et la connoissance des arts; que les nègres ayant eu la liberté de choisir les premiers, se déterminèrent pour l'or, et laissèrent aux blancs les arts, la lecture, et

l'écriture: que Dieu consentit à leur choix: mais qu'irrité de leur avarice, il déclara qu'ils seront les esclaves des blancs, sans aucune espérance de voir changer leur condition."—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. iv, lib. ix, § vii, p. 158.

⁶ When the despoiled Cræsus sent his fetters to Delphos and reproached the gods with his captivity, the Pythian replied, "that he suffered not for his own sin but that of his ancestor."—*Herod. lib. i*, § 91. When we would judge

Israelites, the curse was both rational and just. Wherein, then, did *their* modes of thought, *their* notions of crime and justice, differ from *ours*? In this,

I. That, *with us*,⁷ *right* and *power* are two things separate and distinct one from the other; *with them*, on the other hand, they were frequently confounded together, and, when so confounded, *the power* always included *the right*⁸ to do. Hence, the arbitrary acts so often attributed to their deities and holy men by the ancient nations, Jews as well as heathens.

II. That, *with us*, the great object of punishment is the repressal of crime; *with them*, it was the inflicting pain on the criminal.⁹ Hence it is that *we* study principally the motives of the offender; while *they*, and we must remember that their crimes were crimes against the Deity, looked wholly to the satisfaction of the offended; *they* propitiated anger, and their punishments, therefore, bear often no proportion to the offence which called them forth.

III. That, *with us*, *all* crimes are personal, dishonours those only who are guilty of them; *with them*, on the other hand, *some* crimes were considered hereditary;—they had their seat in the blood, and were handed down from father to son.¹ Such was the sin of disobedience, which

the actions and motives attributed to the Deity in our sacred books, we should look out for similar actions and motives attributed to other deities by their several creeds, and judge them.

⁷ I speak of our age generally. Some barbarous and selfish spirits there are, no doubt, among us, whose cry is: "I can do what I will with my own!"

⁸ The same views we find in the middle ages. Ferrari, in his historical preface to the works of Vico, describing the fifteenth century, observes: "Tutti rispettavano la forza, tutti la impiegavano negli avvenimenti della vita; se un alto personaggio commetteva un' inusanza, gli uomini sensati dell' epoca

dicevano seriamente; *egli non debb' essere signore per niente*. L'Aretino si lamentava perchè il Papa non puniva il suo assassino; *il Papa è il Papa, e tu sei un furfante, gli rispondeva il Berni*."—Oper. di Vico, vol. i, p. 9.

⁹ This may be seen even in the institution of the cities of refuge in cases of manslaughter. I would thus *only partly* account for the atrocities which disgrace the olden codes; for I have elsewhere (National Education) traced those atrocities, and still think they may in part be traced, to the sluggish and uninventive disposition of the half-civilized mind.

¹ Though Moses for *civil crimes* lays down (Deut. xxiv. 6) this

we inherit, with its punishment, from Adam; such the sin of rebellion, punished in Saul and his descendants; and such the sin of idolatry, visited even unto the third and fourth generation, &c.

Remembering, then, the respect to which the patriarch was accustomed, and his power, and also the nature of the insult offered to him, and the anger it must have raised in his breast, we shall wonder no more at the bitterness of the imprecations which he pours forth against his offending son, but shall rather admire his prophetic spirit, which mournfully sees Ham's lawless character working its way, and developing itself in one branch of his descendants, and in them suffering the punishments to which he now foredooms it.

Again, Noah will not curse Ham, because, in Ham, he would curse all Ham's family, even to the tenth generation; he limits, therefore, the curse to the Canaanite branch, and, instead of destroying, Noah thus contents himself with decimating, the race of Ham.

Verses 26, 27. In the blessing of Shem, the Deity appears as Jehovah Elohim; in that of Japhet, as Elohim. Because, however, the blessing of Japhet² is etymological,

grand rule, that "every man shall be put to death for his own sin," he does not observe it in *religious ones*. Thus, for the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, they, and their little children, and all that appertains to them, are destroyed. (Numbers xvi.) Similarly in the Chou-king (p. 60), I find that Ki thus encourages his officers: "Je ferai mourir devant le Che (l'esprit de la Terre) ceux qui seront désobéissant, eux et leurs enfans."—(By the way I must observe that in China to put the children to death as well as the father is a high refinement of cruelty; because there the state of the man in an after-life depends very much on the respect in which he is held by his descend-

ants, and the reverential homage, which is paid to the tablets on which his name is engraved (Vide Coutumes Funèbres des Nations). —But to return to our subject, I see some sins punished on the children. I know that men are cruel in moments of anger, but I cannot but believe, that when this cruelty is legal, part of a system, that there must be a reason for it; in the present case I think I see that reason in the belief that some sins were hereditary. Do not the existence of family priesthods, the divisions into castes, the hate towards particular people, all rest on the belief in such hereditary tendencies?

² "God shall enlarge (Japhth) Japheth." Bochart, Sac. Geog. iii, i.

or rests on a play upon words, and because moreover like the curse on Canaan and the blessing of Shem, it is metrical in its form, i. e. because it has all the characteristics which distinguish the Jehovah portions of Genesis, Eichhorn³ supposes here some corruption of the text, and that instead of *Elohim* we should read *Jehovah*.

With regard to blessings and curses generally, of which there are many examples in the Hebrew Scriptures, we may observe,

I. That once pronounced they could not be recalled. Thus Isaac, though he regrets, acknowledges his inability to annul, the blessing which he unwittingly pronounced on Jacob.

II. That they were prophetic.

1st. As they always related to forthcoming events.

And, 2ndly. As they were sometimes independent of the will of him who uttered them. Thus Balaam, though he would wish to curse Israel, and by this means obtain the favour of Balak, is nevertheless compelled "to speak the word that God putteth in his mouth."⁴

III. That they differed from prophecies.

1st. In that they sometimes depended on, and expressed the will of him who uttered them. Thus it is in Isaac's power to bless Esau in preference to Jacob,—and of his own free will it is that Noah curses Canaan.

And, 2ndly. In that they not merely foretold, but actually influenced the course of events.⁵ Thus, because Isaac blessed Jacob, Jacob becomes lord over his brethren, and has the fatness of the earth for his portion; and, because Noah curses Canaan, Canaan is doomed to be a servant of servants. Similarly in ancient Grecian story, the imprecations (and that without regard to their justice or injustice) of Œdipus, and Amyntor, and Theseus, on their several children, are heard by the gods⁶ and realized.

³ Eichhorn Einleitung in d. Alt. Test. § 416.

⁴ Vide Numbers xxiv.

⁵ Throughout the interviews of Balak with Balaam, Balak seems to look on the curse which he asks of Balaam as a charm which would

alter and determine the course of events.

⁶ Vide Plato, De Legibus, lib. xi, p. 159, Bipont. vol. ix, where he treats of the efficacy of the blessings and curses of parents.

And, even in our day, the Hindus tremblingly acknowledge the efficacy of both the blessings and curses⁷ of their priests, who thus arbitrarily dispense happiness or misery, according as men please or displease them.

Following in the steps of Eichhorn, we have, in the course of our examination, observed that the Jehovah and Elohim portions of Genesis were each distinguished by a peculiarity of thought and expression which warranted the conclusion, that they originally formed two distinct narratives, from which Moses, or whoever was the author of this book, composed his account of the creation, and of the earth's first inhabitants. With Shem, Ham, and Japhet, the antediluvian race perished. Ere therefore we enter on that new scene in which we are playing our brief parts: ere we begin the history of that new world to which we ourselves belong, we will again separate and review the descriptions which Jehovah and Elohim each present us of antediluvian society.

Jehovah shows us man as having already learned to cultivate the earth, and to tame and domesticate animals; and as early beginning to build and inhabit cities. A few generations pass away, and then appear *men*, who are nomadic princes, dwelling in tents, and rich in herds of cattle; *others*, who taught mankind to confine and modulate sounds, and make of them sweet music; and again *others*, who wrought metals into ornaments, and vessels for domestic uses, and instruments of labour and of war. Such were the occupations, and such the state of the arts

⁷ "Si les effets salutaires de leur bénédiction.....leur attirent tant d'admiration et de respect du stupide vulgaire, leur malédiction, qui n'est pas moins puissante, les rend redoutables. Les Indiens sont persuadés *qu'elle ne manque jamais d'avoir son effet, soit qu'elle ait été justement ou injustement encourue.*Les personnes de la suite du gourou.....ne manquent pas de

débiter à ce sujet plusieurs contes ridicules, dont ils disent avoir été les témoins oculaires.... Tantôt c'est une personne morte subitement à l'instant même où le gourou a lancé sa malédiction contre elle; tantôt c'en est un autre qui a été saisi d'un tremblement dans tous les membres, qui dure encore," &c. —Dubois, Mœurs des Indes, vol. ii, p. 168.

among the men with whom Jehovah makes us acquainted. Of their domestic life, though its outlines are faint, he traces the same favourable picture. For, as his wife accompanies the banished Cain, may we not gather that both she and her cotemporaries acknowledged all the sacred obligations of marriage? And because it is Adah and Zillah whom Lamech calls to his councils, is it not fair to presume that he and his age felt the equality of, and honoured the woman? That thus early the authority of the father was respected, the conduct of Shem and Japhet proves; while the curse of Noah presupposes a distinction of ranks, which, coupled with the manner in which the arts then practised are divided among particular *castes*,⁸ induces to the conclusion that the advantages arising from the division of labour were already known and appreciated by the antediluvian men. In their religious worship, too, we meet with the same advance. They sacrifice, and offer *choice* sacrifices. For the purpose of sacrifice, they have already separated the animal creation into two parts, the *clean*, and the *unclean*; and the name which Cain imposes on his son seems to imply, that that son was *consecrated, dedicated*, to God; that he was from his birth a priest;—and public worship must then have been instituted in all the Cainite cities.

The Elohim creates man, male and female; He endows him with dominion over the beasts of the field, and gives him fruit and grain for food. He next shows us man, seemingly the husband of one wife,—though marriage⁹ is by Him limited to the purposes of generation; and He tells us of one man who is the friend and servant of God. He then proceeds to mourn over the wickedness and law-

⁸ Vide chap. iv. 20, 21, 22.

⁹ The formula by which Jehovah expresses the marriage state: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh," symbolically expresses all those higher objects which mar-

riage in civilized countries has in view,—that one will, that community of interests, that mutual comfort and assistance, which render a well-assorted marriage the highest happiness of which our mortal state is capable.

lessness of the beings He has created : He condemns them to perish by a deluge, but first builds for Noah, or teaches him how to build, a ship, in which to save himself and his family. In that ship, before the deluge commences, He commands Noah to enter ; and, after the deluge is over, that ship He bids him to quit ; and now again gives him dominion over the animal creation, and permission to eat of all living things, provided he eat not of their blood : He then adds, as his will, that “ whoever sheds man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed ; ” and concludes by making a covenant with Noah, in which He promises never again to destroy the earth.

These two pictures, viewed separately, are quite in harmony with themselves. *In the one*, man is bold and independent, and relies on his own exertions, and he subdues the earth and all the animal creation to his will ; *in the other*, man is ever a child, ever in leading-strings, he dares make no one step but by the advice, and at the express command of his God and guardian : if he act for himself, he sins : he is, at best, but great prospectively. *The first*, too, necessarily supposes man living under certain laws,¹ and, by the very expressions which it uses to designate beasts for sacrifice, implies that flesh had long been an article of food. *The second*, on the other hand, knows of no sacrifices, of no animal food, before Noah’s time ; and of no laws besides those animal instincts which only are God’s laws, because they are inherent in man’s physical constitution, but which a higher law, God’s moral law, teaches us not how to indulge, but how to moderate. These two pictures then, viewed separately, stand in strong contrast one with the other. Unite them, endeavour to make one picture out of them, and you have a composition without keeping, without harmony,—a host of discrepancies, almost contradictions, which the most artistical care, the most anxious desire, by an addition here, an omission there, vainly strives to reconcile. You have the first chapters of the book of Genesis.

¹ Vide supra, p. 163, 164.

With this tale we may connect,

I. The laws in *Exod.* xxi. 15-17, &c.; the fifth commandment, and, as an exemplification of it, the story of *Ruth*; the threats contained in the latter part of the second commandment, and the several curses in *Deut.* xxvii.

II. The hate shown by the Israelites to the people of Canaan, and the cruelties exercised on them; and, as a fulfilment of the curse on Canaan, the slavery to which Gideon is condemned by the princes of Israel. (*Josh.* ix.)

CHAPTER VIII.

GENESIS x. 1—32, and xi. 1—9.

“The sons of Japhet,”—*Ἰαπετός*, Japetus, appears in Grecian story; he is one of the six Titans, but is remarkable only as the father of Prometheus.¹

“Gomer and Magog.” They are represented in Ezekiel xxxviii. as a martial people, whose armies, consisting of cavalry and infantry, were well appointed;—the former, men and horse, are described as wearing armour; the latter, as numerous, and as armed with shields and swords.

“Javan, Tubal, and Meshech.” Jaones, Iones, the name of one of the Greek races. Javan is the ancestor of the Greeks; and Javan is the name by which Greece was known to the Asiatics, in the time of Alexander. (Daniel viii. 21. Bochart Geog. Sac. lib. iii. chap. iii. Goguet Orig. des Lois, vol. i. p. 58.) Javan, with Tubal and Meshech in Ezekiel’s picture of the commerce of Tyre, is represented as trading in vessels of brass and slaves.²

“Tarshish” is celebrated in Hebrew story for the commerce which it carried on with Solomon, through its own ships, and those of Hiram of Tyre. Its exports seem to have consisted of raw materials merely; gold and silver, iron, tin, and lead, elephants’ teeth, and apes, and peacocks.”

¹ Diod. Sic. lib. v. chap. 66.

² Chap. xxvii. 13: They traded the persons of men and vessels of brass in their markets.” And com-

pare Eumæus’ account of his Phœnician nurse, Odys. *δ* xv. 402.

³ Vide 1 Chron. x. 22; and marginal reading; and Ezek. xxvii. 12.

Its navy, however, must have been considerable and of high repute. (Vide Isaiah xxiii. 1, and lx. 9.)

“Chittim and Elisha.” The first, also a naval power, (Numbers xxiv. 24) was famous for its ivory; the second, for a blue and purple dye,³ which was inferior only to the Tyrian. Elisha is supposed to be Elis. (Bochart, *ib.* ch. iv.)

“The sons of Ham.” Mizraim is one of the Scripture names of Egypt, and it doubtless implies, that from Ham the Egyptians were descended. Their early greatness, their progress in all the arts of civilization, it is needless, and would be out of my power, to insist upon. Their renown the sacred books of the Jews, and Greek poets, historians and philosophers, loudly speak, and a thousand ruins confirm it.⁴

“Phut.” The men of Phut, mercenaries doubtless, composed the heavy infantry of Tyre. They were armed with shields and *helmets*, and seem to have been held in high repute.

“Sheba, Dedan, and Raamah.” All commercial cities. Dedan traded in ivory and ebony, and its “clothes for chariots” were costly and much esteemed. Sheba and Raamah brought to Tyre incense, spices, precious stones, and gold; and the caravans of Sheba were besides loaded with blue cloths, and brodered work, and rich apparel. Dedan and Sheba then dealt not merely in raw produce, but in manufactures also, and their merchants seem to have been much considered in the fairs of Tyre.⁷

“Babylon, Nineveh.” What busy crowds of men are here! what mighty works of art! lakes, canals, palaces, and hanging gardens! what barbaric grandeur! what hosts of conquered nations! And these once crowned queens, who, with almost Bacchanal riot, *erst* shouted forth their

³ Ezek. xxvii. 6.

⁴ Id. verse 7.

⁵ Vide Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians.

⁶ “They...of Phut, were in thine army, thy men of war: they hanged the shield and helmet in thee (Ezek. id. verse 10.) “Persia and Libya

(Phut) with them, all of them with shield and *helmet*,” id. xxxviii. 5. And in Jeremiah xlvi. 9, the Libyans are opposed to the Lydians, “that handle and bend the bow”—light troops.

⁷ Vide Ezek. xxvii. 20, 22, 24; and for Sheba, Isaiah lx. 8.

great names, and paraded their youthful beauty, in the presence of subject and admiring Humanity, *now* widowed and childless, sit silent and mournful, brooding over their hopeless desolation.

Sidon. "The Great Sidon." She who had Tyre for her daughter,—“the crowning city”⁸—she is the eldest born of Canaan the accursed. Her citizens distinguish themselves in history, as those who first made the art of navigation serve the purposes of commerce.⁹ They were besides great astronomers and arithmeticians, and are supposed to have been the inventors of glass; they were indeed celebrated for their skill in all arts.¹

Notwithstanding their descent, the Sidonians were not, it would seem, included in that implacable hate, which Moses compelled Israel to vow against the Canaanite. Whether it was that they were a peaceable, orderly, and quiet people,² whose neighbourhood could only be advantageous; or whether it was that their city afforded a convenient market or *débouché* for the various productions of Palestine;³ certain it is, that Moses never advised, and none of his successors ever attempted, the conquest of Phœnicia: on the contrary, as the Hebrews grew more civilized and more powerful, we find them entering into stricter friendship, and even “brotherly covenant,” with Tyre, the successor of Sidon.⁴

“The Arvadite,”—a race of seafaring men; they are mentioned in Ezekiel xxvii. as serving in the navies of Tyre.

⁸ Judges xi. 8; xix. 28; Isaiah xxiii.

⁹ Goguet Orig. d. Loix i. 281.

¹ Homer calls them Σιδόνες πολυδαίδαλοι, Iliad, 743, lib. xxiii; and see the note from Strabo on this verse, in Clarke's ed.; also, (ib. vi. 289,) the account of the robes given to Helen by Paris, ἐργα γυναικων Σιδονίων; and compare Prov. xxxi. 18, 19.

² Vide Judges xviii. 7. On the moral character of Sidon, history I believe is silent; but her celebrated

daughter Carthage is handed down to us as a bye word for all selfishness, avarice, treachery, and cruelty. See Michelet Hist. Rom. book 11, chap. iv.; and the account Diodorus gives us of the mode in which the gods are appeased on the defeat of her armies by Agathocles.

³ Ezek. xxvii. 17.

⁴ Amos i. 9. Michaelis Mosaisches Recht, vol. i, § 25; and Heeren, Ideen 1 Theil. 11. Abtheilung Fabriken, &c. der Phœnicier, p. 132.

The sons of Shem. From him are descended *Elam*, the Persians, or first inhabitants of Persia, and the children of Eber, the Jews; and the descendants of Lud, the Lydians and Armenians;—with the exception of the Jews and Persians, nations no way celebrated either in this or in any former time.

Verses 8 and 9. According to Eichhorn, this is but the fragment of some old poem, and one to which we doubtless owe all that has been preserved to us of the life and deeds of Nimrod. These *ancestral* poems, we have before observed, are the oldest national records; traces of them are evident throughout even the most historical parts of the Jewish Scripture.⁶ By the *Chinese* they have been collected, and they form that one of their King's or sacred books which solemnly celebrates the great men and the great deeds of the olden time.⁷ Among the *Greeks*, they have been bound up into, and lost in, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer. And among the *Gaels*, they appear under the name of Ossian. To them belonged those *national hymns*,⁸ once sung by the Roman youth; and to them also those verses, in which German and Scandinavian bards,⁹ and

⁶ "A Semo enim orti sunt Syri, Assyrii, Lydi, Armenii, Persæ, Elymæi, et innumeri alii Dei cognitione prorsus expertes."—Boch. Sac. Geog. book, vol. ii. §. 1.

⁶ Thus, e. g. the song of Moses, in Exod. x, is evidently the original whence the historian has drawn his miraculous account of the passage of the Red Sea.

⁷ Mem. Chin. vol. ii. p. 74.

⁸ The *πατριαι ὕμνοι*, mentioned by Dionysius, from Fabius Pictor, lib. i. § 78, of which Cicero Tus. Quest. remarks: "Gravissimus auctor in originibus, dixit Cato, morem apud majores hunc epularum fuisse ut qui accubarent, canerent ad tibiam clarorum virorum laudes atque virtutes."—From Michelet Hist. Rom. vol. ii. p. 68, which consult on this matter.

⁹ Selden, notes to book vi. of Drayton's Polyolbion; Toland's History of the Druids, Select Pieces, vol. i, p. 53 and 191; Schlosser Alt. Gesch. vol. i, p. 312; and Lafitau, Mœurs des Sauvages, vol. ii, p. 193.—"Ceux qui font profession de jouer du Balafo sont des nègres d'un caractère singulier, et qui paroissent également faits pour la musique et la poésie..... Les rois et les seigneurs du pays ont toujours de ces Guerriots près d'eux, pour leur propre amusement et ceux des étrangers qui paroissent à leur cour..... Ils accompagnent leurs instruments de diverses chansons, dont le sujet ordinaire est l'antiquité, la noblesse, et les exploits de leur prince."—Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. iii, p. 176, Negroes of Gambia.

perhaps American warriors and Negro Guerriots "harmonically celebrated valiant performers." These songs lived in the memories of the people, and made their children familiar with great deeds. In war they served to stir the warriors on to battle; and in peace they enlivened the social board, and graced the solemn feast of state. They were a national literature emanating from and influencing the national character.

Chapter xi. verses 1-9. How difficult it is to divest oneself of the notions which have been pressed on us in childhood! How almost impossible not to lend to a sacred book those thoughts and meanings with which time and a host of commentators have overloaded it! In studying this Genesis, I feel all the influence of long-established opinion: I read, but through other men's spectacles: I see, but with other men's eyes: like some excited somnambulist, I am dead to the *real* world before me: I live with phantoms: I converse with beings that exist not, and answer, but only to words that never have been uttered. And what cunning sophist, or what powerful magician, hath done all this? Our nursery is before me with its dark wainscot; we are crowding round the antique fire-place, covered with Dutch tiles rich in holy legends, of which our loved old nurse explains the purport. *There* is the fatal tree, with its golden apples; *there* rises the smoke of Abel's accepted sacrifice; *there* God's winged chariot bears away the pious Enoch; *there* the ark, closed against the shrieks of drowning men, *now* floats upon the waters, and *now* on dry land pours forth from its sanctuary Noah's family and birds and beasts; *there* too, are the plains of Shinar, where men, with giant labour, are building up the lofty Babel, a spiral ladder by which they hope to mount to heaven; and *there* the hand of God is on the tower's summit—and it crumbles, toppling down on the heads of fleeing nations.

And is not all this in the book? To keep to our subject; read the simple tale. The inhabitants of the world,

of one language, have hitherto lived as one family,¹ they have pitched their tents together, journeyed together. Now considerably increased in numbers, and fearful of being dispersed, they determine to build a city, with a lofty tower² to serve either as a citadel or as a landmark in their hunting excursions, and to "make themselves a name," *i. e.* to form themselves into a nation. Jehovah, however, is jealous of their power, and confounds their language, and scatters them over the face of the earth. And "they leave off to build the city."

Eichhorn is of opinion that this tale merely expresses in a mythical form, that originally the inhabitants of this earth formed one family; and that, animated by the same desires, united in one purpose,³ they began to build a city; but that, in the course of the work, dissensions arose among them, quarrels, and that they gradually separated, or were scattered abroad; and that from this separation proceeded all varieties of language.

Kanngiesser takes an even more *secular* view of the myth. He supposes that the Syrian shepherd race, who had hitherto wandered from valley to valley, once attempted to make a permanent settlement on the Tigris. Here they began to build a large circular wall (for the protection of their flocks), and a watch tower (to guard against any sudden and hostile attack.) The mountaineers however,—to whom other necessities, another mode of life, had given

¹ "And the whole earth was of one language.....and.....as they journeyed together" (verses 1 & 2), they, the whole earth.

² "Whose top may reach unto heaven." Compare Deut. i. 28: "Whose cities are great, and walled up to heaven." This tower was certainly not intended to save its builders from any future flood. For such a purpose they would have built arks and not towers, or if towers, they would have erected them not in plains, but on the tops of mountains. Besides, what fear could they have of a deluge when

they had so lately received the assurance of Jehovah that he would never again smite every living thing? Besides to the reason which I have given, that it is the one which induced the people to build the city, the very occupation of Nimrod points.

³ "The whole earth was of *one language, one lip.*" One lip or mouth is used in other parts of Scripture in the sense of "mind—accord." Vide Josh. ix. 2; 1 Kings xxii. 13; and similarly "division of tongues" for "dissension." (Psalms iv. 9.)

another character and a different language—united under Nimrod, fall upon them and drive them from their hold and put them to flight; part of them are thus scattered abroad, while a part fall into the hands of the victors. In this encounter, the shepherd race, who for the first time heard a language different from their own—their own they naturally enough considered the only possible one—regarded its unintelligible jargon as a miracle, and also, because in a difference of language they saw the occasion of many misunderstandings and much hostility, as a divine punishment.⁴

To this interpretation we may object.

1st. The context, which positively asserts that the whole earth was of one language;—and,

2dly. The improbabilities which it contains.

It shows us the shepherd races in their own opinion the only inhabitants of the earth, and yet represents them as building walls and towns for protection—against what or whom? Not wild beasts, or wherefore the tower? and not against one another, for they were all allies, relations; but against strangers, enemies. They had seen then, or surmised, the foot-mark on the sand:—they knew that they were not alone; that the earth contained men, and men different from themselves in habits, dress, colour perhaps, and wherefore not different from them in language? Kangiesser's interpretation in fact refers the myth to the first surprise, which men of a particular race felt on discovering that there were other races besides their own on the earth: and yet he shows us these men acting in a way which makes such a surprise impossible.

On Eichhorn's interpretation we may observe, that it would account naturally enough for the different languages

⁴ I have found this in Gesenius' art. on *Babylon*, in Ersh und Grübers Encyc.; it is taken from Kangiessers *Grundriss der Alterthumswissenschaft*, p. 61-66. As I have not this work, and do not, therefore, know the reasons on which its author grounds the interpreta-

tion he has given of the tale, my objections to it may fall wide of their mark. For local circumstances, which seem to me to confirm it, the reader may refer to Heeren's *Ideen*, vol. i, Perser, Abschnitt, i. c. ii, § i, p. 220.

which prevail, if all of them bore some marks, however obscure, of a common origin.⁵ But though many languages can be traced to one parent stem, yet are there several parent stems, which, as far as our present knowledge extends, we are unable in any way to connect together.

The simple and vulgar interpretation of this myth, moreover, seems to me better to accord with Moses' views and modes of thought, than do these more subtle and artistical glosses. For after a beneficent Deity had created this pleasant earth and man as its possessor, what was the first question Moses necessarily asked himself,—what the first difficulty which he sought to solve? This, surely. How, if God be good and powerful, and man his favourite creation, came death into the world, and all our woe? And what is his answer? Man disobeyed his Maker's command; and death and disease are his punishment; or, in other words, physical evil is the consequence of sin. And now that a former world has been destroyed, now that another race possesses the earth "in their lands, after their nations," what is the phenomenon in this new world of men, which must present itself to the mind of Moses, as something opposed to his doctrine of a common ancestry, and as something therefore to be accounted for? Why, that all these nations, though descended from the same parent, and though from that parent necessarily receiving by tradition the languages which they speak, do in fact all speak different languages. Whence then these languages? We, with the Burma doctor,⁶ may partly account for them by

⁵ Eichhorn (*De Diversit. Linguarum*, Bib. bib. Lit. vol. iii, p. 981) has seen this objection and avoided it, by boldly asserting that Noah's flood was not universal. As my object is to endeavour to learn what this sacred book says and means, I am precluded from making these *emendations*; and see also Michaelis, *Comment. ad h. l.*

⁶ "All mankind being the offspring of the same stock, a certain Burma doctor asks, Why is there

not the same language among all nations, and whence arises that variety of manners, religions, complexions, and features, &c., observable among the inhabitants of this earth? This same doctor thinks he answers the questions, by saying that the first inhabitants of the world, after having greatly multiplied, were forced to emigrate to various parts of the earth, and as in these the climate, air, water, natural productions, and temperature

long separation, varieties of wants, the consequence of the varieties of climate, soil, &c. But the slow ^{progress} of natural causes little suits the rapid and religious imaginations of the first poetic historians of Humanity. *They* would see God everywhere; but to them He visibly appears only in things strange, in accidents sudden and unaccountable.⁷ They see indeed His hand in the hope-giving rainbow and the all-destroying earthquake, but they can find no trace of His presence in the noiseless step of nature, and can hear no echo of His voice in that sweet and ever-living music which lures man on to civilisation. What wonder is it, then, that the descendant of wandering patriarchs, the shepherd of Jethro's flock, he who loved the plain and the desert, and who sought the mountain to die, should find in the building of the first diluvian city the original cause of that great distinction which still separates, and will for ever separate mankind, and should triumphantly point to its ruins and its name in corroboration of the truth of his hypothesis?

“Go to, let us make brick—and let us build us a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven.”

are extremely different, such circumstances could not fail to have produced an effect on the religion, manners, &c., of those who were under their influence.”—*Asiatic Researches*, vol. vi, p. 254. I have said *partly account*: for, the objection to “natural causes,” supposing men to have a common origin, I have stated in opposition to Eichhorn's view. The fact is, taking Moses' account of the creation and his picture of the first man as true,

I see no way of accounting for any variety of languages but by a miracle, and one miracle is as probable as another. For the common descent of the human races, Kant, *Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen*, is the best essay I know. For their separate descent, Cuvier argues in his *Règne Animal*, and Schlosser, *Gesch. der alt. Welt*, vol. i.

⁷ Hence the excuse which Agamemnon offers to Achilles. Of his conduct he says:—

“Εγὼ δ' οὐκ αἰτιὸς εἰμι

Ἄλλα Ζεὺς, καὶ Μοῖρα, καὶ ἡεροφοῖτις Ἐριννυς,

‘Οἱ τε μοι εἰν ἀγορῇ φρεσὶν ἐμβαλον ἀγρίων ἀτην

‘Ἡματι τῷ, ὅτ Ἀχιλλῆος γέρας αὐτοῦ ἀπῆρτων.’—II. xix, 86.

“Ego autem non in causa sum

Sed Jupiter et Saturn, et per tenebras vagans Erynnys

Qui mihi in concione menti injecerunt sævam noxam

Die illo, quo Achillis præmium ipse abstuli.”

According to Plato,⁸ every deluge destroys not merely man, but man's civilisation also. According to Genesis, in the deluge mankind perishes, but the arts he has invented, the knowledge he has acquired, survive in the individuals who are preserved. *The first* shows us the diluvian men after such a catastrophe falling back almost to the primal barbarism. Without metals, and without implements of labour, they can neither cultivate the earth, nor build for themselves houses; they dwell therefore in mountain caves or mud huts, or wander about in search of pasturage. They are however acquainted with fire; they know how to work clay⁹ into vessels for domestic uses; the chase and their own numerous herds supply them with food (flesh and milk) and clothing. With abundance for their wants they are too rich, and without silver and gold they are too poor, to quarrel. Their lives are pure and simple and religious, such as idyllic poets love to paint. *The second*, on the other hand, immediately after the deluge represents the father of the present world as planting a vineyard and making wine, and his children in the third generation as already inhabiting the low countries, and as having wandered to the plains of Shinar; here they remain some time, and here at length resolve to settle and to build a city. But Shinar¹ is without stone or wood; in certain parts of the plain, however, are found large strata of a clay which is peculiarly suited for bricks, and *in others* a bitumen which answers all the purposes of mortar.² These natural advantages our diluvian men turn to the best account; "they make bricks and burn them, and slime have they for mortar," and with these materials they begin to build their city: they determine besides on gracing it with a lofty tower or citadel, the erection of which required no little skill

⁸ De Legibus, lib. iii, commencement.

⁹ "Αι πλαστικαὶ γὰρ καὶ ὅσαι πλεκτικαὶ τῶν τεχνῶν οὐδὲν προσδεονται σιδήρου," &c.—Id. vol. viii, p. 110.

¹ Vide Heeren Ideen, Th. i, Abth. ii, v. d. Lande d. Babylo, p. 159.

² Herodotus (lib. i, c. 180) describes Babylon as built with the materials mentioned in the text. He adds, that of the clay which was obtained from the trenches, were made the bricks with which the city was built.

in architecture, and proved that they had not lost the memory of some of those arts by which the sons of Lamech had earned their fame. So much the Book of Genesis tells us. But the nature of the climate in Shinar is such, the heat is so great, the droughts so excessive, that its soil, the marvellous fruitfulness of which Herodotus fears to mention, is, though liable to frequent inundations, without the aid of artificial irrigation completely unproductive. The art then of making canals, and of distributing the water with which these canals were supplied over all parts of the plain by means of smaller trenches and even machines (according to Herodotus)³ must have been known to the followers of Nimrod; otherwise, with the world before him where to choose, the leader of mankind had not settled in a country, the manifest inconveniences of which were compensated by no peculiar advantages. The diluvian men of Moses are then learned in the arts, and wise in the things of this world; but they are at the same time contemnners of all authority, rebellious, irreligious; they are in every thing the antipodes of the diluvian men of Plato.

Humboldt's Spaniard,⁴ nearly naked and black as a Zembo, with his wife and daughter as naked as himself, wandering in the Savannahs of America, and retaining only the recollection and the prejudices of civilized life without any of its real advantages, surprises me not. I understand the degradation of the individual. I understand too how sundry arts are lost or fall into disuse; but I cannot understand how man whose arts and knowledge, according to Moses, escaped the wreck of the deluge; who never forgot how to till the earth, or to work iron; and who, some hundred years after his almost total destruction, already began to build cities and erect lofty towers, should as a nation ever sink back into a negro of the interior of Africa, a mere savage that subsists by the chase and cowers in the woods like a wild beast, without clothing,

³ Vide Heeren, *ut supra*; and Herodotus, lib. i, c. cxiii; and Berossus in Fabricius Bib. Græc. vol.

xiv, p. 185, and Cory's Fragments.

⁴ Humboldt, *Voy. Nouvelle Espagne*, vol. iv.

without a hut, and save a few hissing sounds, almost without a language. With Moses' picture of the diluvian men before us, the intellectual degradation of Humanity seems to me impossible, save by a miracle. The confusion of tongues could alone dissolve a society such as he represents.

Verses 6 and 7. Well might Calypso say—

“ Insatiate are ye gods, past all that live,
In all things ye affect which still converts
Your powers to envies.”⁵

That Adam might not become “as one of us,” a God, Jehovah Elohim drove him from Paradise; and *now*, lest man should continue united and happy and attain unheard-of powers, Jehovah confounds his language and scatters him abroad upon the face of the earth. In the eyes of infant Humanity, how *great* is mankind! how *little* the Deity!

Of this Babel, a legend far more interesting to Humanity than the deluge, for the one but killed man's body, the other to a certain extent destroyed his soul,⁶ we do not find the memory preserved among the ancient nations. “*The people of the East*” (*the Hindus*), Roberts asserts, “have nothing which corresponds with the scriptural account of the confusion of tongues.”⁷ *The Zendavesta*, too, makes no mention of such an event, which is equally unknown to the *Chinese books*.⁸ *The Chaldeans*, however, according to

⁵ Odyssey, lib. v. 108.

⁶ Because man's morality, its nature and purity, depends on his intellectual acquirements.

⁷ Sir W. Jones, however, is of opinion “that the lion bursting from a pillar to destroy a blaspheming giant (the giant with a golden axe), and the dwarf who beguiled and held in derision the magnificent Beli (Beli, or Vali, was like the giant, an impious and arrogant monarch) are one and the same story” with our legend (vide Works,

vol. iii, p. 195, and compare vol. iv, p. 63); and see Robertson's Introduction to Sac. Scrip. p. 16.

⁸ The author of “*L'antiquité des Chinois*,” however he may repudiate the charge, certainly attempts to draw a parallel between Yao and Nimrod. Yao digs canals, irrigates the country, and builds towers—and the tower in Chinese *hieroglyphics* is, it seems, the symbol of separation, of a son who quits his paternal roof: “Le caractère du mot ‘Tsou,’ que nous tra-

Berosus, relate, "That the first inhabitants of the earth, glorying in their own strength and size, and despising the gods, undertook to raise a tower whose top should reach the sky, in the place in which Babylon now stands; but when it approached the heavens, the winds assisted the gods and overthrew the work upon its contrivers; and its ruins are said to be still at Babylon; and the gods introduced a diversity of tongues among men, who till that time had all spoken the same language, and a war arose between Chronus and Titan. The place on which they built the tower is now called Babylon, on account of the confusion of tongues; for confusion is by the Hebrews called Babel." The same tale is repeated in the Sibylline Oracles,⁹ probably from Berosus; in Alexander Polyhistor and Hestæus, &c.¹ In the *New World* we find "the confusion of tongues" known to the *Mexicans*. After the deluge, they relate, "that Concox and Chicheetzal, the only survivors of the human race, engendered many children; that they were all born dumb, but that they one day received the gift of speech from a dove which came and perched itself upon a lofty tree. But as the gift was not of the same speech, as these people did not understand one another, they determined on separating. Fifteen heads of families however who were fortunate enough to have obtained the same language, set out together in search of a new habitation. After wandering from place to place for one hundred and four years, they at length settled on the borders of a lake and built Mexico." *The Tlas-*

duisons 'commença,' est composé d'une *image de tour* et du symbole de sacrifice. Il signifie 'aieu, principe, origine;' mais comment rendre en Français la signification d'un pareil caractère? Nous n'osons en donner l'analyse telle qu'on la trouve dans les livres. On nous soupçonneroit à coup sûr de l'avoir forgé pour rapprocher Yao de la tour de Babel, et on nous accuseroit de l'avoir rêvé si nous dirions que l'image *tour* toute seule, signifie par métaphore *s'en aller, se*

séparer, fils qui quitte son père."—Compare Mémoires des Chinois, vol. i, p. 213, with id. p. 222 & 224.

⁹ For the little faith to be put in them—vide Fabricius, Bib. Græca, vol. i, lib. i, c. xxxii, § 5, p. 206; and c. xxxiii, p. 216, &c.

¹ Vide Cory's Antient Fragments, p. 34-50. Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenus are but copyists of Berosus. Vide from Geor. Syncellus Fab. Bib. Græc. vol. v, p. 178.

² Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. xviii. p. 341.

*calan*³ and *North American*⁴ legends may be also quoted, as darkly intimating the same event. *The first* shows us the men who are preserved from the deluge changed into monkeys, and only after a time recovering their form and reason; *the second* makes the flood to destroy the whole human race without exception, and then re-peoples the earth by changing beasts into men. But of *these legends* we must put aside the *Chaldaic*, for it appeals to Hebrew authority, and is no doubt partly borrowed from the Hebrew books. And of *the others*, we will observe, that their similarity with the legend in Genesis is *formal* merely; for *they tell* of the first step in civilisation, of a gift of speech and reason, of benefits conferred upon man, while *Genesis speaks* of fearful punishments inflicted on him, of a regress to barbarism.

If now we consider this legend in connexion with the history of which it forms a part, it will present some difficulties. For

I. It shows us the inhabitants of the earth journeying from the east: and yet their course from Ararat, on which the eighth chapter lands them, to Shinar, would have been almost due south.

II. Though the confusion of tongues, supposing Moses' picture of the first men to be a faithful one, sufficiently accounts for the sottish barbarism into which so many people have sunk, it is not in keeping with what he relates of mankind some *two hundred* years after this event.⁵

III. *The preceding chapter* speaks of Babel as the beginning of a kingdom, which in time included Erech, and Arcad, and Calneh, all in the land of Shinar. *Our legend*, on the other hand, represents Babel as a great unfinished ruin deserted by its builders, who are thence *scattered abroad* over the whole earth. And if, to remove this difficulty, we suppose with the Jew Rabbins and the Greek fathers, that the confusion of tongues only separated man-

³ Id. id. p. 597; and see p. 193, ii, p. 148; and see p. 195, supra.

⁵ Vide chap. xii. 15; xiii. 2;

⁴ Thatcher, *Indian Traits*, vol. xiv, xx, &c.

kind into families; *i. e.* if we suppose that only so many new languages arose, as there were at that time families on the earth;⁶ or, in other words, if we suppose that the individuals of each family all suddenly and simultaneously forgot old and familiar words and all simultaneously expressed themselves in new and unwonted sounds, which all of them simultaneously understood and applied to the same thoughts, feelings and objects: we may then indeed send forth each family to seek out for itself some new settlement, and there build its Erech, or Arcad, or Calneh. But as the essential characteristic of this legend, considered as a religious legend, is the dispersion of mankind lest mankind should become too powerful; and as only one hundred and fifty years were sufficient to make of eight individuals a great people, we will very naturally ask, where then was the utility of this most astounding miracle which, considered as a punishment, only retarded man's progress, but did not destroy his powers; which made him change his place, but not his plans; and merely drove him from the banks of the Euphrates to those of the Tigris?⁷

iv. We may remark on the extraordinary appropriation of the languages which were then thrown among mankind. Well indeed does Babel deserve its name, for *there*, with the speech of mankind his races also were confounded; *there*, in the scramble that took place, families of *different* races seized upon the *same* language, while *different* families of the *same* race obtained each of them *totally different* languages. *There* the sons of Eber and of Canaan, the blessed and the cursed, caught and shared between them the same tongue, for both spoke dialects of the Semitic;⁸ while

⁶ Vide Bochart. Geog. Sacra. Phaleg, lib. i, c. xv.

⁷ Vide id. ib. lib. iii, c. xx.

⁸ Its dialects were the Cappadocian, spoken to the west of the Halys; the Syrian, between the Mediterranean and the Euphrates; the Assyrian, on the borders of the Tigris; the Chaldaic, in Babylon; the Hebrew and Samaritan, in Pa-

lestine; the Phœnician, on the sea-coast; and the Arabic, in Arabia and the steppes of Mesopotamia (Heeren Ideen, Th. i, Abt. i, p. 145). See also Rollin, Histoire Ancienne, Des Carthaginois, vol. i, § i; Michaelis, Einleitung in Alt. Test. Eichhorn, Einleitung in Alt. Test. c. i, p. 59; and Calmet, article Canaan. Taylor's E.

to brothers of the same stock, Mizraim and Canaan the children of Ham, and Aram and Arphaxad the children of Shem, 'were given severally languages totally different one from the other; for Mizraim spoke Coptic, Aram first Zend and afterwards Pelvic; Canaan and Arphaxad, Semitic.'

Of this *section* we may observe that it belongs to *Jehovah*.

i. With Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord, we may connect Ishmael and Esau, both cunning hunters, and both deemed unworthy of becoming the fathers of the chosen people.

ii. With the legend of Babylon, in so far as it shows us Jehovah angry and coming down from Heaven, we may compare Jehovah Elohim banishing Adam from Paradise, and Jehovah sitting in judgment upon Cain and going forth to destroy Sodom.

iii. With it, in so far as it represents man scattered abroad, we may connect the expulsion of our first parents from Eden, and the banishment of Cain.

And iv. with the confusion of languages we may contrast the gift of tongues made to the disciples at the feast of Pentecost.

⁹ Jacob and his family spoke the language of Canaan; yet his sons, when they address Joseph, thinking him an Egyptian, address him through an interpreter. (xlii. 23.)

¹ Heeren says: "Als Hauptsprache Asiens muss man die Semitischen und Persischen Mundart ansehen" (vol. i, p. 149); and again:

"Jenseits des Tigris fingen die Persischen Sprachen an, die nicht nur in ihren Wörtern und Ausdrücken, sondern auch in ihren Bau und in ihren Elementen *von den Semitischen* so gänzlich verschiedenen waren, dass man sogleich in ihnen *die Zweige eines ganz andern Stammes* erkennt."—Id. id. p. 146.

CHAPTER IX.

GENESIS xi. 10-32.

Chapter xi. verses 10-11. If we compare this genealogy with that of Noah in the fifth chapter, we shall find the lives of men after the deluge considerably shorter than they were before it, and that they shorten with each generation, but still exceed the bounds of probability. The same exaggerated notions of the lives of the first men are, however, to be found in the Egyptian, Hindu, and Chinese mythologies. The first kings of Egypt of divine origin reigned each of them more than twelve, the last more than three, hundred years.¹ During the golden age, human life, according to the Hindus,² extended to a hundred thousand years, but with each age diminished in a subdecuple ratio. The Chinese books give to the first ancestors of mankind a life of eighteen hundred years, and the first founders of the empire reign a hundred and sixteen and a hundred and forty-five years.³ Every where,⁴ in fact, we find that man fills up the blank pages of history by adding to the years of his ancestors.

From this genealogy, it would seem that Abraham was sixty years old when Noah, Jacob about fifty when Eber, died. We may also observe, that as Noah was the tenth in descent from Adam, so Abraham was the tenth from Noah.⁵

¹ Diod. Sic. lib. i, c. xxvi.

² Asiatic Researches, vol. x, p. 70

³ Des Guignes, Chou-king, Dis. Prelim. p. 65.

⁴ Throughout the East, except in the Zendavesta.

⁵ Of the geography of the Hindus Willford observes that "truth is sa-

crificed to a symmetrical arrangement of countries, mountains, lakes, and rivers, with which they are highly delighted." I cannot but observe the same symmetrical arrangement, but of generations, in Hebrew story. See Asiatic Researches, vol. viii, p. 372.

Verse 31. Fourmont⁶ asserts that Terah was the Phœnician *Oupavos*, and Abraham *Xpovos*, or Saturn, and he brings forward in support of his hypothesis a great many very ingenious reasons, against which one can only set the equally ingenious reasons of Hyde⁷ to show that Abraham and Zoroaster were one and the same person; of Bochart, to prove that Noah was Saturn;⁸ of Kircher, that Noah was Cœlus, and Shem Saturn; and of many others, all of whom have each his own peculiar view, though all agree in finding the gods and heroes and civilisation of the old world in the men of the Hebrew Scripture.⁹

“Ur of the Chaldees.” Ur, it seems, signifies fire; and as fire was held sacred among the Chaldæans, the city Ur, probably dedicated to fire, was like the city Enoch a sacred city probably; and thus, if we may be allowed to give way to conjecture, differed from Babel the city of Nimrod which was a city of warriors;—*the one* gathered its inhabitants round a temple, *the other* about its lofty tower, its citadel; *that* afforded protection, sanctuary to the fugitive; and *this* received and enrolled the discontented and rebellious, and sent forth its soldiers to war and plunder.¹

The Chaldees, according to Diodorus Siculus, were claimed by the Egyptians as their descendants; and they are spoken of by him, not as a race or nation, but as a family or tribe set apart for the worship of the gods. Their language however proves them to be of Semitic,² and not of Egyptian, origin; and the monsters, half-

⁶ *Anciens Peuples*, vol. i, p. 63, &c. His proofs are etymological. See the excellent observations of Sir W. Jones on these conjectural etymologies, *Works*, On the Origin of Nations, vol. iii, p. 198, 199.

⁷ Hyde, *De Rel. Vet. Pers.* passim.

⁸ Bocharti, *Geog. Sac. Phaleg*, lib. i, c. i, p. 1.

⁹ Vossius first erected *this Euemerism* into a system; he has been followed by Bochart, Kircher, Dickenson, Marsham, Huetius, Thomassin, Cumberland, Fourmont, &c.

Of the first, the temple of Hercules at Tarechea, to which the servants of Paris fled (Herod. lib. ii, c. 113), is an instance: of the second, the Norman bands who so long desolated Europe.—See Michelet *Hist. France*, vol. i. p. 394.

² *Hist. lib. i*, c. 28.

³ This we know from those portions of the Jewish books which are written in Chaldaic, &c., and yet Jeremiah speaks of the Chaldees as “of a nation whose language thou knowest not.” Chap. v. 15.

men half-fish, *the Annedoti* mythic beings, but in common parlance the strangers in ships, that came up from the Erythrean sea and taught them all arts and sciences, and how to construct cities, and to distinguish the seeds of the earth, are evidence that their civilisation was derived: and their cosmogony so nearly resembling the Egyptian induces the conclusion, that it was derived from Egypt.⁴

The Chaldees are here mentioned for the first time in the Hebrew books, and ages are to pass away ere they *again*⁵ appear within the sphere of Jewish story; and *then*, to play how great a part! to give to their freedmen a new alphabet, a new language, and with it other arts and other modes of thought, which do not always seem very naturally to dovetail into the old and genuine Jewish notions.

This section belongs to Elohim.

If now we compare this genealogy of Abraham with the other genealogies in the preceding chapter, we find: that *the first* troubles itself little with the fate and fortunes of mankind, that it confines itself to the immediate ancestors of the great father of the Hebrew nation, and that it evidently mentions the three sons of Terah only because their children were either historically connected with Abraham, or had intermarried with his descendants; it is in a word a mere family pedigree: that, the second, on the other hand, continues to grace itself with old lays, and to find in names a prophecy or a history; and that, as it *before* recorded the inventors of useful arts, so *now* it illustrates the great men of past times; that it notes the founders of the first great cities, and views its generations relatively to the lands which they occupied; that it is, in short, a chart of the then known world, the preface to a universal history.

If now we view together the cursed races of the two

⁴ Berossus, Cory's Fragments, pp. 23, 31.

⁵ And yet according to Isaiah, they are a new people: "Behold the land of the Chaldeans; *this* people was not till the Assyrian

founded it for them that dwell in the wilderness."—Chap. xxiii. 13. In Jeremiah, however, chap. v. 15, they again appear as "an ancient nation."

worlds, how similar must seem to us their fate. Mighty men of valour, builders of cities, inventors of the useful and elegant arts, *both* have perished away from the earth. Of the Hamite race however Nineveh and Babylon, Thebes and Memphis, Tyre and Sidon, were once monuments. They were the ancient world's brightest jewels; and their *mythic* lustre still rouses the wonder, and is dear to the memory, of modern man. We still linger among their ruins, and turn over every stone, and gather up every fragment, in hope that some ray of light may break upon us, and open to our view the life of the fathers of our civilization.

Examine now the blessed race, Sethite and Semitic. Through twenty generations the son regularly succeeds the father, and their numbered years are our guides to the world's age. Of it we know only that its members begat children, and then died. Do we then owe it nothing? Humanity does not thus throw about her crowns: on her tablets are written some infamous, but no ignoble names. To this race we owe the knowledge of the one God; to this race a great example of justice, benevolence, piety, and trust in Providence, shown us in the life and character of Abraham; and to this race we owe this great book, which gives us the only complete history of the religious idea, as forming the character of, and developing itself in, a nation.

But, moreover, this genealogy, this heap of names, which a filial love has so carefully collected and preserved, and which here and there a halo of piety adorns,⁶ has not been, I believe, altogether without its influence on our morals and character. Contrasted with the brilliant genealogy of Ham, does it not point to and exemplify that saying of Christ, "My kingdom is not of this world?" Does it not remind us of that eastern virtue, so gentle, long-suffering, and patient, which, though it possesses a

⁶ According, however, to Joshua, chap. xxiv. 2, 3, Terah, and perhaps his fathers, wore like the rest of the

world around them, idolaters; or at least "served other gods," — acknowledged a plurality of gods.

quiet grandeur, is for us of the North⁷ too passive, too confined, too effeminate, too egotistical? Of that virtue which, if it be prepared for sacrifices, is powerless to affront dangers, which teaches man to die, but not, though indifferent to life, to struggle on his own or others' account against death, or tyranny, or persecution, or for liberty, or for the civic rights of his country?⁸ It was a law, in the great city of ancient Europe, that every honest man should take share in the commotions and disturbances of his native land. I understand the devotion of the citizens of Athens. To suffer with patient dignity is the great doctrine of Eastern morality; and I see why Mohammed Shah, though he shudders from a battle with Kouli Khan, so calmly prepares the poison for himself and his wives, and his children.

⁷ This distinction has not escaped the eastern moralists. "Qu'est-ce que la force?" asks one of his disciples of Confucius. "*Chez les peuples du midi*, répondit ce sage, elle consiste à gagner les cœurs à la vertu par la bienfaisance et la persuasion, et à les dégoûter du vice par la patience et la douceur; c'est la force des philosophes. *Les peuples du Nord* la mettent à dormir vêtus sur des arcs et des lances, et à affronter sans pâlir les dangers et la mort: c'est la force des héros." (Tchong-Yong, ou Juste Milieu, vol. iii, p. 462, Mém. Chin.) Confucius judges the North as a man of the East, as a civilized man barbarians. Those barbarians have however not remained stationary;

they too have become civilised; and their morality, to all the manly daring and fortitude of the North, adds the graceful virtues of the East.

⁸ "Qui connaît," says again Confucius, "les charmes de la vertu, et en est épris, brave la mort pour aller à elle: mais si un royaume est sur le penchant de sa ruine, le sage n'a garde d'y entrer; *s'il est agité de guerres intestines, il s'enfuit; si les lois sont sans vigueur et les crimes impunis, il se cache.*" (Id. id. p. 465.) This morality is almost a necessary consequence of the high respect, the idolization of the paternal authority. Vide supra, p. 175, 176.

CHAPTER X.

GENESIS xii. 1-20.

Verses 1-3. This book of Genesis has hitherto presented us, not so much with a history of the human race, as with fragments of histories, traditions, and genealogies, which if they account for many of the phenomena of life, serve at the same time to connect mankind with the Jewish people and the Jewish God. Now however that it has shown us Abraham leaving his country and his kindred and his father's house, it confines itself to his history, and that of his family, which, with here and there an exception,¹ it relates in two continuous narratives drawn from the sources Jehovah and Elohim. With this chapter properly begins the Jewish history.

If we now turn back to the years of the patriarchs, we shall find that *Noah* lived to witness the power and the kingdom of Nimrod, the confusion of tongues, and the birth and manhood of Abraham; and that Eber, already a father before the dispersion, was also a cotemporary of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. During the lives of these men then, many cities were built, many kingdoms founded, and Egypt had already made considerable progress in civilisation, and the arts and sciences. But, in all this long lapse of centuries, where was Noah? where Eber? in what deep valley had they hid themselves? in what pleasant land pitched their tents? While cities and palaces rose around

¹ As chap. xxxiii. 18-34; xxxvi. xlix. 1. 27. Vid. Eichhorn *Eiuleitung* in A. T. 1.

him, was Noah still content to live amid his flocks and herds? And his sons, arrived at the age of manhood, did they, as *now* among the most primitive of the nomadic races,² go forth to seek their own fortunes, to become themselves heads of houses, perhaps fathers of nations? And alone and deserted did the great patriarch linger out his centuries?—Around him surely were gathered the most loved of his descendants, the chosen family of Eber? Nay was it not from his lips that Abraham learned the heavy judgments of God and the future fate of mankind? What Nahor and Terah³ in the tents of Noah? idolators in the holy place of the Elohim? Jehovah forgotten even where he should have been most remembered? and the flood, and the wonderful ark, and the covenant, and the rainbow, old wives' tales even at the hearth of him who had experienced all, suffered all? It cannot be.⁴ Where then dwelt Noah? where Eber?

Again: man journeys to Shinar, and determines on designs which are displeasing to Jehovah. Who then ruled the counsels, who was the head, the chief, of this great family? Not Noah certainly but Nimrod,⁵ he, the

² "Le P. du Halde dit que chez les Tartares c'est toujours *le dernier* des mâles (Shem) qui est l'héritier, par la raison qu'à mesure que les aînés sont en état de mener la vie pastorale, ils sortent de la maison avec une certaine quantité de bétail que le père leur donne, et vont former une nouvelle habitation. Le dernier des mâles donc qui reste dans la maison avec son père est son héritier naturel."—Montesquieu *Esprit des Lois*, lib. xviii. c. xxi. p. 242. Hence, perhaps, the origin of the sign "tower," among the Chinese. Vide note ⁸ to p. 252.

³ "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old times; even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nahor, and they served other gods, and I took your

father Abraham, &c." Jud. xxiv. 2.

⁴ In absence of any positive proof, the probabilities are clearly against this supposition; and yet on this supposition is built the hypothesis for the traditional knowledge of Moses of the facts which he relates. Taking it for granted that Noah was still alive 349 years after the flood, there is no reason to suppose that Abraham ever saw him.

⁵ Buddæus argues that Nimrod made himself the chief or captain of those who after the dispersion remained near Babel. "Qui enim," he asks, "initium regni ejus esse potuit, cum nondum esset?"—Hist. Vet. Test. vol. i, p. 229. But how many difficulties does this view invite; though in truth any explanation of the legend is but a choice of difficulties.

beginning of whose kingdom was Babel. Had Noah then like the old Laertes laid down his authority?⁶ or did the popular "rage despise his empire"? or had Nimrod, as his name would imply,⁷ dispossessed him of his place? In no way does this book enable us to guess at the relation in which Noah stood to his descendants.

Noah however has disappeared from the scene. Nimrod is now chief and king. Then, as Nimrod is the cotemporary of Eber's father, of him who lived *four hundred and thirty-three years* and who lived therefore to see the Pharaohs of Egypt and the Abimelechs of Gerar: how is it that of this Nimrod's existence, save perhaps as remembered in the burden of some old song, Abraham appears so wholly unconscious?—But Nimrod perchance was dead?—What, are not the long years of the patriarchs noted to show us the superior vigour of the men of olden time? Are we to suppose that *their* lives were specially lengthened; and that all other men, after some short span of eighty years, perished away as we do? How then is it that these Methuselahs died and left no sign? while the ephemeral races built cities, invented arts, founded governments, made of themselves in a word men? Assuredly the years of the children of Shem are the years of the men of their generation. Into what fairy land then had, in the days of Abraham, the kingdom and the power of Nimrod fled? With Amraphel king of Shinar and other kings, his allies, Abraham wages battle, and totally overthrows

⁶ "When with cares

For his lost son he left all court affaires."—Odyss. xxiv. 377.

Achilles, however, Odyss. xi. inquires of Ulysses, whether "his father still commands the Phthian throne, or whether Phthian and Thessalian rage despise his empire."

⁷ "Est aliquod in Nimrodis nomine ominosum nisi fortasse ex eo quod fecit deinceps eo nomine dictus fuerit. Significat enim Heb.

sermone, *rebellem*."—Witsius Miscel. Sacr. vol. ii, p. 207, de Assyris. Witsius then goes on to tell us how Nimrod got his power: "Et sane neglecta auctoritate Noë, cui imperii partes omni jure hactenus competierant, principatum erigere molitus est; allectis, ut rebellantes solent, a paterno Noë præsidio, ad sua castra, complurimis.—Id.

them. Was then Nimrod dead? Had he perished in his youth, centuries before his time? Was this Amraphel his successor? or had other sovereigns intervened between them? And was the mighty Babylon—she who was the earth's eldest daughter and the mother of great cities—already reduced to a petty kingdom?⁸ Who can unravel the difficulties of this story?

“I will make of thee a great nation.” The Jews are the people in whom this prophecy is supposed to have been fulfilled. Were they ever a great nation? They were never great in the arts of peace or war; never great in science; never in power, nor even in numbers. Nevertheless, they are great; for their history is still for us a subject of deep contemplation; and the idea which they were set apart to develope, the unity of the Godhead, their creed, is the basis of the religion of the whole civilized world.

“And I will make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing. . . . and in thee shall all the families,” &c.

And great indeed is the name of Abraham! Civilized man cherishes its memory; and Mahomedans and Christians contend who shall pay it most reverence. But in the time of Moses, had it already spread among the people of western Asia? Is it known either to the history or the mythology of the pristine nations? Or is it only in this book that we hear of it?

Through Josephus⁹ we learn,

1st. That Berossus makes mention of a certain Chaldean who lived in the tenth generation after the flood, and who was celebrated for his power and justice, and skill in all celestial things.¹

2ndly. That Hecatæus, a cotemporary of Alexander,

⁸ From the whole of the fourteenth chapter it seems to me as if Shinar, Eleasar, were like Sodom, &c., tributaries of Chedorlaomer.

⁹ Antiq. Jud. lib. i, c. vii, § 2.

¹ “Καὶ τὰ οὐρανια ἐμπειρος” are the words of Josephus from Berossus—

—is it on their authority that Eupolemus the Jew has constructed his account of Abraham, on their authority that he tells us that the Chaldeans speak of Abraham as the inventor of astrology and magic?

not merely speaks of Abraham by name, but has actually written a treatise on his life and character. And,

3rdly. That Nicolaus Damascenus relates of Abraham, that he came out of Chaldea with an army, and possessed himself of, and reigned over, Damascus, but that he afterwards removed with his followers into Canaan.

And through Hyde² we hear that the Brahmins of India derive their name from Abraham; that the ancient Persian faith is called, "Religio Abrahami-Zerduscht;" and that constant tradition makes Abraham the founder of the temple at Mecca.

Without remarking on the scantiness of the testimonials which Josephus has collected, we shall at once proceed to examine whether they are such as to induce us to ascribe any extended reputation to the name of Abraham.

Damascenus³ was the friend of Herod, and his ambassador at the court of Augustus. He was employed too by the Jews to plead their cause before Agrippa, and he pleaded it with a Jewish heart, and like one well acquainted with the Jewish laws and customs: he could not but have been acquainted with the Jewish books. Hecataeus was an officer of Alexander's, and afterwards of Ptolemy Lagus.⁴ He wrote a history of the Jews, and a treatise on Abraham. He speaks of Jerusalem as though he had visited it. He served with Jewish troops, was acquainted with the High-priest, and seems to have mixed much with Jews. What shall we say then to the testimonies of these men when they speak of Jewish heroes? Shall we not regard their writings, in absence of any evidence to the contrary, as derived from Jewish sources, and resting on Jewish authority, and as insufficient therefore to prove that the names they would glorify were known to any other than the Jewish people? As to Berossus, we may doubt,

² Hyde de Rel. Vet. Pers. c. ii, p. 31, 38, from Sharistan; De Primis et Ultimis, Phârangh Sururi, &c., Arabian works; and the Koran, c. iii.

³ Antiq. Jud. lib. xii, c. iii, § ii; and compare lib. xvi, c. ii, § iv, and c. x, § iv.

⁴ Josephus cont. Apionem, lib. i, § xxii.

1st. Whether by his anonymous Chaldean he indeed intended Abraham. And,

2ndly. Whether (supposing him to have intended Abraham) he did not become acquainted with his character through the Hebrew books.

To Hyde's conjectures we may object,

1st. That *as he*⁵ would derive the Brahmins from Abraham, so others,⁶ and with just as much show of reason, have derived Abraham from the Brahmins.

2ndly. That the name of Abraham is altogether unknown to the Zendavesta; and moreover that his character as a nomad is at variance with its notions of excellence.⁷

And 3rdly. That the passage⁸ in the Koran, to which Hyde alludes, and which seems to appeal to tradition, may not improbably be itself the origin of the tradition. It was, according to Sale, "received by Mohammed when the Jews said that their Keblah, or the temple at Jerusalem, was more ancient than that of the Mahommedans, or the Casba."⁹

⁵ "Quosdam," says the Arabian author, "existimare Brahmanos sic dici ab Ibrahim; id tamen fieri non posse.....Sed Brahmanos sic dici ab homine cui nomen ABRAHAM." On this objection of his author Hyde observes: "Hoc modo Shahrastani disputat contra seipsum, ignorando quod Ibrahim apud Arabes sit idem nomen quod Abraham et Braham, quæ dicti nominis Abrahamatici forma apud Persas." —De Vet. Pers. Rel. p. 31; and vide Morhof's Polyhistor, vol. i, lib. i, c. x, p. 89.

⁶ Clearchus makes Aristotle to say that the Jews were *απογονοι των εν Ινδοις φιλοσοφων*.—Josephus, ut supra.

⁷ Thus Djemschid is a builder of cities, a civilizer of men, a cultivator of the earth. Vide Fargard ii, iii; and see the Persian hate of the Arabs justified by their extraction, note ¹, p. 165, supra.

⁸ The passage is this: "Verily the first house appointed unto men to worship in, was that which is in Becca; blessed, and a direction to all creatures. Therein *are manifest signs; the place wherein Abraham stood*," *i. e.*, they show the print of Abraham's feet; and compare Prelim. Dis. p. 154, &c.

⁹ See Sale's notes to chap. ii. of Koran. The fact is, the Koran, and Old Testament, and Gospels, have spread the names of the Biblical personages throughout Asia. Thus in Syria every great work is attributed to Solomon (Volney's Travels, c. xxix and xxxi), and all the best horses in Arabia are traced up to the studs of David and Solomon. And even in India the Mahommedans have imagined scriptural genealogies for the native tribes; thus the Afghans are the descendants of Saul. Vide Von Bohlen d. alt. Indien, vol. i, p. 7.

On the whole then we may conclude, that Abraham owes indeed his reputation to the Hebrew books; but that Christians and Mahomedans first extended that reputation beyond the confines of his family, and made it universal.

“In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.” In thee, thy descendants. As the poor Jew wanders from land to land, are blessings poured upon his head? Do cities rejoice in his sojourn? Are families proud of his alliance? *Every where* he is hated or despised: *every where* only tolerated: *every where* he finds his name a by-word for obstinacy, and credulity, and avarice, and meanness: and *every where* the haughty Christian, or the haughtier Mahometan, maligns his character, and envies his gains which hard labour, superior prudence, and a frugal life, gradually heap up into wealth. And yet *this man*—whose heart petty persecutions and continued insults have perchance crushed, whose once warm affections now rest only on his gold, whose character is in keeping with his degradation—even *this man*, with unshaken faith and fond hope, points to this prophecy as a certain evidence of his and his nation’s future greatness. This prophecy *we however* find most extraordinarily fulfilled in the character and doctrine of Christ: and his pure and bright religion, obscured by ignorance and prejudice and defiled by the dark passions they foster in man, has *hitherto* worked its good in secret, almost unperceived; though *now* indeed that it is undergoing transfiguration, now that it is beginning to throw off its earthly coil and to show itself in its grand simplicity, it gives us hope and evidence, as the bright clouds that herald in the rising sun, of the universal light and blessings of perfect day.

“I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee.” Not thee, the individual only, but thee, the nation, of which thou shalt be the ancestor; and to that nation, Israel, Balaam applies the blessing, “Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee!”¹

¹ Numbers xxiv. 9.

Jehovah makes with Abraham a league offensive and defensive: He becomes Abraham's protector and patron, and instals Abraham as His favourite: He identifies Abraham with Himself: for Abraham's sake He promises to change the great laws of providence, and henceforward to deal out good or evil to men, not according to their character and conduct, but according to their character and conduct in relation to Abraham. And hence it is that for an injury to Abraham Pharaoh and his house are plagued; and hence it is that for betraying her country to Israel Rahab² the harlot is saved out of the accursed city, and deemed worthy of becoming the ancestress of Jewish sovereigns and of the Messiah; and hence too it is, because "they have reproached and magnified themselves against the people of the Lord of Hosts," that "Moab is as Sodom, and the children of Ammon as Gomorrah."³

In other creeds we find similar views; in the Deity the same favouritism; and in the dealings of the Deity with men, the same constant regard for his favourites. Thus, in Greek mythology, for his injurious treatment of Chryses Agamemnon sees his army perish by the arrows of Apollo.⁴ And thus, in the Brahmin faith, great rewards are promised to him who does good to Brahmins; "while he who sheds their blood shall feel excessive pain in after life: as many particles of blood as the dust shall roll up from the ground, for so many years shall the shedder of that blood be mangled by other animals in his next birth."⁵ And thus too according to the Zend, blessings are the portion

² Joshua vi. 17. With the conduct and the fate of Rahab compare the conduct and the fate of Tarpeia in Roman story. And now that we are comparing together Jewish and Roman traditions, with the safety awarded to him who betrayed Bethel, contrast the punishment inflicted on the schoolmaster of Falerii, and choose between the song of Deborah glorifying Jael for the murder of Sisera and Cæsar's

just reception of the assassins of Pompey.

³ Zephaniah ii. 9, 10. See also 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 14, 15; Nehemiah iv. 4.

⁴ See in Herod. (lib. vi, § 75) the account of the madness and death of Cleomenes, and the various sacrileges to which it was attributed.

⁵ Vide Laws of Menu, chapter on Economics, § 116, 117, Sir W. Jones' Works, vol. vii.

of all who tend upon and honour the creatures of Ormuzd, while terrible punishments await those who willingly injure them.⁶

In these views we may observe that the Zend is alone consequent. Its double creation, and the war which it supposes to subsist between the creatures of Ormuzd and those of Ahriman, a war in which Ormuzd is represented as gaining the vantage by and through his creatures, compelled it to regard every thing which could benefit the creation of Ormuzd as a religious duty and pleasing to Ormuzd, and therefore to be rewarded by the good things which Ormuzd bestows upon his followers. To the Brahminical and Jewish cosmogonies, however, these notions of favouritism are strange,—they appear as after-thoughts, as mere addenda, introduced to justify the exclusive claims of a class or nation to rights which belong to mankind. Thus, as Brahma is the God “from whom all things proceed, and to whom all things must return;”⁷—and as the Elohim is He who made all creatures “after their kind;”—*in the sight of the one* no difference of creatures, and *in that of the other* no difference of creatures of the same kind, should naturally find place. But between creatures Nature *has* made a difference. *The creed of the first* therefore was obliged to have recourse to a series of emanations to account for the superiority of one creature over another; and it at the same time took occasion to gratify the vanity of its priestclass, by giving to that class a more honourable birth than to the rest of mankind.⁸ *The creed of the second* had not so many difficulties to contend with;

⁶ See the duties to dogs, *e. g.* Fargard xv. vol. i, p. 396.

⁷ From the Gayatri, or holiest verse of the Vedas.—Sir W. Jones' Works, vol. vi, p. 417.

⁸ “That the human race might be multiplied, He caused the Brahmin, the Chatriya, the Vaisya, and the Sudra, to proceed from his mouth, his arm, his thigh, and his

foot.”—§ xxxi. Compare id. § 92, 93, On the Creation, from the Laws of Menu. See also p. 111-12, *supra*. There the creation is examined from a lower point of view—here it is viewed in its first principle, as delivered in “the Gayatri, the mother of the Veda.” Vide Sir W. Jones' Works, Preface to the Laws of Menu, vol. vii, p. 89.

unlike the first, which is a metaphysical⁹ system, it deals in facts, it proceeds to work historically; and as all barbarous people are ever self-conceited, and self-conceited just in proportion as they are barbarous, it seeks a reason for the holiness of the nation to which it belongs in the holiness of that nation's ancestors, and in the promises which their holiness exacted from the well-pleased Deity.

But these false views, alas! are not confined to Jewish and Heathen creeds: irrational and antichristian as they are, they have made their way into *our Christianity*: they are justified by examples in the Christian books. Thus the deceit of Ananias and Sapphira, their lie to Peter is represented as a lie to God, and they are struck dead.¹ And thus too the opposition of the Jews at Antioch to Paul and Barnabas is threatened with a punishment more terrible than that inflicted on Sodom and Gomorrah.² And thus for his intrigues against the Christian doctrine Elymas the sorcerer suddenly becomes blind. But it will be answered, that deceit and a lie are ever crimes against God; that the Jewish opposition to Paul and Barnabas was an interested opposition—the opposition of wicked and obstinate men; that Elymas prosecuted an unlawful calling, was leagued with the prince and powers of darkness, or was at least an impostor; and that therefore Ana-

⁹ *i. e.* The difference which the one makes to exist between the several classes of men are differences in kind; while the differences which the other insists upon are accidental merely.

¹ A woman in Siberia, who had been converted to Christianity, in a fit of jealousy killed her husband; "Les Tartares croyoient que leurs démons l'avoient porté à ce crime pour qu'elle fût elle-même punie d'avoir abandonné la foi de ses pères, et embrassé le Christianisme." — *Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. xviii, p. 393. See also in *Diod. Sic. Fragmen. lib.*

xxxvi, Bipont. vol. x, p. 169: the punishment which the tribune Aulus Pompeius suffered for ill-treating one Batanes, a Phrygian priest.

² "But they shook off the dust of their feet against them, and came to Iconium."—Acts xv. 11. "And whoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily, I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city."—Mark vi. 11.

nias and Sapphira, the Antioch Jews and Elymas, were all deservedly punished.

When the woman taken in adultery was brought before the Christ, he but answered, "Let him that is guiltless cast the first stone." On Ananias and Sapphira, who now among us will sit in judgment?—The fact however is, that it is not the mere lie³ which this story condemns, but the lie as told to Peter and the Christian community; and, because so told to them it is held up as a lie to the Holy Ghost. Examine also the case of Elymas the sorcerer; he is allowed free room and verge enough so long as he meddles not with Christians and Christian doctrine; but the moment he comes forward to withstand Paul he is struck blind. What now is the natural deduction from "*these judgments?*" Why *this* surely,—that crimes which affect the *pious* are more deserving of punishment than those which merely injure the common herd of men; that such crimes God takes it upon Himself to punish, and to punish signally. Hence, consequently, among pietists a constant expectation that God will take their cause into His own hand, and see His sacred ministers righted.

Take now the opposition to Paul and Barnabas at Antioch. When the martyr Stephen perished beneath the stones of the Jews, Paul was consenting to his death. Was Paul at that time dishonest? Was he but a shallow hypocrite, who hid himself under the guard of a mad fanaticism? Paul assuredly never was a hypocrite, but one of those enthusiasts whose belief was so heartfelt that he conceived not how any other belief could a moment obtain. By himself he judged others, and not by themselves. Hence his presence at the martyrdom of Stephen; and hence his condemnation of the Jews at Antioch,—a condemnation which, if we receive as just, will, in connexion with the other instances adduced, have no little influence on our moral character: for we shall then institute ourselves judges of *what is*, and *what is not*, truth; and all

³ Vide Judith ix. 10; and xi. 16, 19.

opposition to our views we shall regard as interested and obstinate opposition,—as a crime not against us, but against the Holy Ghost;⁴ and we shall then feel justified in going any lengths to put down that opposition. Hence we shall have inquisitions; or, if our common sense rises against inquisitions, articles of faith, pet doctrines by which, if temporal pains and penalties be out of our power, we shall test the salvation or damnation of our neighbours.

What shall we say then—that holy men are not, more than others, the especial care of Providence? That I know not; but this I know, that *as* every evil thought is punished even in the thinking, and every evil act even in the doing, *so* also ignorance is punished by its own darkness, and narrowness of mind by its own littleness; and that no holy man therefore, in so far at least as he is holy,⁵ will shake the dust off his feet in judgment against his opponents, but will either pity them for their obstinacy, or look into himself to find there the reason of their opposition.

Besides, who are holy men? “Not every man,” says Christ, “who calleth me Lord, Lord, shall enter into my kingdom.” Who then are holy men?—Philippe de Comines⁶ relates, that when he was looking at the body of John Galeas I of Milan, a native of Bourges who was then present called the said John a saint: “Et je lui demanday en l’oreille,” adds De Comines, “pour quoi il l’appellât saint, et qu’il pouvoit voir peinctes à l’entour de luy les armes

⁴ Thus the Abbé de Clairvaux, when he finds that the *heretics* (Albigenses) of Vertfeuil will not listen to his preaching, plays the part of Paul and Barnabas: “alors secouant contre eux la poussière de ses pieds, pour leur faire entendre qu’ils n’étaient que poussière, il partit, et reportant ses regards vers la ville, il la maudit, en disant: Vertfeuil, que Dieu te dessèche.” The prelate’s blessings are worth less than the meanest coin, but his curses are ever powerful; in the present in-

stance the historian himself witnessed their accomplishment.—From Guil. Pod. Laur. apud Michelet, *Hist. de France*, p. 469-70.

⁵ Paul, great as he was, had his faults, and terrible must have been the punishment of this one; how his large and tender heart must have grieved under the thought, that so large a portion of his brethren and of mankind were doomed to so fearful torments!

⁶ Mémoires, livre vii, c. 9, ed. Petitot.

de plusieurs citéz qu'il avoit usurpés, où il n'avoit nul droit. Il me repondit tout bas, 'Nous appellons, dit-il en ce pays icy, saints tous ceux qui nous font du bien.'"⁷ This "Bourgeois" saint we laugh at; but are we more reasonable? Men now are saints who pray daily, and endow chapels, and subscribe largely for the conversion of the heathen: men are saints who build Sunday-schools, and distribute soup and blankets to the poor, and hate popery: men are saints who worship the idol of their generation,—for it is their generation that canonizes them. But I image to myself that great day when we shall all appear before the throne of God, each one seen now through no false medium, and dressed in no specious colours; and then methinks how many a man whom the world has contemned, persecuted, vilified, whom even perhaps the laws have punished, will stand forth in all his native nobility! how many another too whom we have judged unworthy, hard-hearted, cruel, will wear the spotless robe of innocence! Yes, before the blood covered Batta⁸ fresh from the carnage of heretical Boodhists; before the stern inquisitor who knew not how to pity what the Church had doomed;⁹ before the Indian son who

⁷ For the same reason Charles de Blois, whose name is stained by terrible massacres, was canonized by the priests: "Il se confessait matin et soir; entendait quatre ou cinq masses par jour..... Voyait-il *passer un prêtre*, il se jetait à bas de cheval dans la boue," &c. Michelet, *Hist. de France*, vol. iii, p. 314.

⁸ Batta was an Indian philosopher of the sect Nyayan, *i. e.* Reason. He distinguished himself in the massacre of the Boodhists by his sect; and afterwards, to purify himself from the blood he had shed, he with great solemnity burnt him-

self in honour of Juggernaut.

⁹ I allude to him who called his sovereign (Philip II. of Spain) to account, and made that sovereign do a penance of blood for the cry of pity which escaped him when he saw one he had known and loved make part of a procession in an *auto-da-fé*. Or look even at the first inquisitor, the stern St. Dominic, him who led on that bloody persecution against the Albigenses (see Sismondi, *Histoire de France*, thirteenth century), him whom the careless Voltaire makes Grisbourdon to meet at the very threshold of hell, and to whom

"L'ombre répond d'un ton mélaucolique:
Hélas, mon fils, je suis Saint Dominique."

look at him as he appears in Roman Catholic writers—his perse-

cuting spirit is the spirit of his age—his fervent piety, his tearful elo-

La Pucelle, livre v.

pressed his mother to the funeral pile ; before the heathen father who devoted his eldest born to Moloch ; before these whom we condemn, and many others our cotemporaries whom we shudder from, how shall we, so prudent in well-doing, so well-guarded in all words and deeds, so respectable in morality, and so decent in religion, before these, how shall we stand, shivering in our nakedness and littleness.

Verse 5. And Abram took Sarai his wife and Lot his brother's son." Nahor and Terah, Joshua informs us, were idolaters. Was Lot of the same faith as his fathers, and did he accompany Abraham but in execution of his grandfather Terah's plan? Or did he accompany him as a convert, a disciple, one whom his words had moved to a belief in his doctrine? The care of the Lord to save Lot from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah makes it most probable that Lot was of the same creed, worshipped the same God as Abraham.

Verses 6 and 7. Abraham having journeyed until he arrives at Moreh, the Lord there appears before him and promises the land to his seed. There is something touching in the pride of half-civilized man ; it is like the pride of children, knit to home and the things of home, it is unselfish. You do not find him boasting his own virtues, parading his own merits, admiring his own greatness ; he dwells rather on the antiquity of his nation, the splendid actions of his ancestors, the beauty of his native city, the superior excellence of his country, &c. He is therefore either God-descended, or descended from one whom the God's cherished ;¹ or he is either an antochthon,² one whose

quence, his self-denying charity are his own—see him giving all that he has to found a monastery for the daughters of the poor nobility, and then, “ entendant dire à une femme que si elle quittait les Albigeois elle se trouveroit sans ressources ; *il voulait se vendre comme esclave, pour avoir de quoi rendre encore cette*

âme à Dieu”—and then condemn him.—Michelet, *Hist. de France*, vol. ii, p. 479.

¹ Hence the epithets of Homer: *διοτρεφεων βασιλεων*.—Il. ii, 98, &c.

² Vide on the epithet *διφνης*—Emeric David, *Recherches sur Jupiter*, Appendix, vol. ii, p. 600.

first parents sprang from the very earth which that parent's descendants now inhabit; or if no antochthon, if a foreign soil claims him for her own: then his Gods have appeared to him, have bid him travel to some other and better country; they have accompanied and led him³ on his road, and strange signs and wonders have pointed out the promised land. Thus Æneas is driven from shore to shore, till "post tot discrimina rerum," the eaten plates and the farrowing sow point out the seat of the world's future capital.⁴ Thus too Djemschid, armed with the golden poniard, in obedience to Ormuzd travels eastward, and every where he cleaves the earth with his poniard and renders it fruitful and fills it with domestic animals; but when he arrives at the Ver, there he builds a great fortress. and founds a people and the city of Ver-efschône.⁵ Thus, too, the Mexicans, promised a great kingdom by their god Vitziliputzli, leave their country, and on their road conquer many nations, build several towns, but still journey onwards, till the promised sign, an eagle perched upon a fig-tree growing out of a rock, warns them to stay, and there fix the centre of their empire. And thus also, when Manco Capac and Mama Oello are sent forth with a golden rod by their father, the sun, to civilise mankind, they too wander from place to place seeking the heaven-appointed spot, until they at length arrive at the valley of Cuzco, where the golden rod driven into the ground wholly disappears, and thus advises them that here is their destined residence: and here therefore they begin to build the city of Cuzco.⁷

³ So the Sabines were led on by a wolf and a magpie in their descent from the mountains; so Cadmus followed a crow into Bœotia, and so a goose and a goat marched at the head of a great army of pilgrims in the first crusade.—Michelet, *Hist. de France*, vol. i, p. 228.

⁴ Vide Virgil, *Æneid.* viii; Dion. Hal. lib. i, § lvi.

⁵ Persepolis? Vide Fargard iii, Zend.

⁶ *Histoire Générale des Voyages*,

vol. xii, p. 525: "Ce fut dans ce lieu même qu'ils commencèrent à bâtir leur ville à laquelle ils donnèrent le nom de Tctmichitlan, *i. e.* le Figuier sur un rocher. De là vient que les armes de México ont toujours été une aigle regardant le soleil, les ailes éployées, tenant un serpent dans une de ses griffes, et l'autre patte appuyée sur une branche de figuier des Indes."

⁷ Garcilasso de la Vega, *Histoire des Yncas*, liv. i, c. xv.

Of these several legends, the Persian and Peruvian attribute *the one* to Djemschid, *the other* to Manco Capac, the same high motive of travel, the civilisation of mankind and the spread of what each presumed to be true religion; the Roman and the Mexican, on the other hand, know only the desire of empire; while the Jewish differs from them all, both in that it shows the land promised to be a good and fruitful land, and in that it shows the Jews proceeding thither because the land is good and fruitful, and has been promised to them by their God on account of the merits of their ancestors. Do we not then, even in these legends, see that Mexico and Peru, Rome and Persia, are nations that have given to themselves a mission; that if prosperous, they must spread themselves either by force of arms or force of reason, or both; that some way or other they must either be themselves subjugated, or subjugate to their power the people around them? That the Jews on the other hand, limited to the seed of Abraham, have their portion of earth⁹ assigned them, their own God too, and their own law;¹ that they are thus *shut up in* themselves, and *shut out from* all the rest of the world; and that as Jews therefore, they never can be any other than the inhabitants of Canaan, or refugees in some other part of the globe?

“And there builded he an altar unto the Lord.” It is only in the land of Canaan that the patriarchs raise altars. Did they by these altars take possession of the country as modern Europeans, by planting their standard, appropriate newly-discovered lands? Or, unlike the altar of Noah which was built for the purpose of sacrifice, were these altars intended as memorials, that in the place in

⁸ “Que mon désir s’accomplisse” cries Zoroastre. “Ce que je vous demande, O Ormuzd! c’est que les envieux deviennent Mehéstans sans péchés, que sur le champ dans le lieu où étoit le péché on ne voye que des œuvres pures.”—Zend, vol. i, Ha xxxi, p. 168.

⁹ “Moses draws a line from Si-

don to Lasha, and from Sidon to Gaza; and in like manner the Rabbins draw a line from the mountains of Anana to the river of Egypt; whatsoever is within that line belongs to the land of Israel; whatever is without that line is without the land.”—Calmet, art. *Canaan*.

¹ Deut. xxxiii. 4.

which they were erected God had appeared; and were they then an evidence that the country belonged to Jehovah? In the old world each country had its god, to whom its inhabitants, whoever they might be, paid due honour.² That the Israelites were not untainted with this superstition of their time is clear from the many denunciations which their books contain against all who should worship the idols of Canaan. Moses therefore shows them that these idols are interlopers, and that their God Jehovah is the real and original God of the country; and he thus shows them, that Jehovah—who as a family God, a penates, accompanied them from place to place—had also his own land in which he loved to dwell, and which he had promised to them as his people; *i. e.* he shows them a Deity who is at once a family and a local God, and who therefore to affection for them as his children, unites love to their country as his country, and who being thus every way their God will no more suffer another God³ near him, than a lawful monarch will call an usurper to share his throne.

Abraham builds his altar on a mountain. Mountains hold a conspicuous place in the religions of antiquity. And—

1. Because of their awful majesty, and that they seem to touch the Heavens, and are difficult of access; and also because *in fair weather* their summits appear either cloud-

² Thus the people sent to Samaria (2 Kings xvii. 24-28) ask for a priest to teach them the religion of the country. Thus also the citizens of Apis, and Morea, though not Egyptians, are compelled to observe

the religious rites of the Egyptians, because their cities are judged to be in Egypt. (Herod. lib. § xviii.) And thus, too, Æneas, on finding himself on the destined land, immediately

—————“Frondeuti tempora ramo
Implicat, et Geniumque loci, primamque Deorum
Tellurem, Nymphasque, et adhuc ignota precatur
Flumina.”

Æneid. vii, 135.

And see Feithii Ant. Hom. p. 11. To a similar notion probably was owing the conversion in mass to Christianity of the barbarians after their occupation of the Roman empire.

³ The Jews in general sin not in rejecting the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, but in adding to his worship the worship of some other God; like the Athenians in all things they were too superstitious.

covered or light-illuminated; and *in foul*, are the centre of the gathering storm—they have been made by infant nations the dwelling-place of their gods. Thus Merou is the home of the Hindu Deities, and Albordj was the habitation of the Persian Ormuzd. On Olympus the Grecian Jupiter was wont to hold his court: and on Sinai the Hebrew Jehovah first appeared to Moses, and in the temple on Zion afterwards dwelt.⁵

And II. Because they are to the merely sensual eye nearer to Heaven than the plain, because from their heights the God can much more readily hear man's prayers and wishes, and because too they are, as natural altars, which the earth herself has raised to the Deity,—to the Deity man has hastened to consecrate them;—on them he has ever loved to sacrifice and to build temples and to raise altars. Thus in China, though *in later ages*, four⁶ mountains, one on each boundary of the empire, were set apart for religious purposes; *in the earlier times*,⁷ the first eminence, the nearest hill, served for the holiest sacrifice. The Persians, Herodotus represents as performing sacrifice on the highest mountains; and the Zend shows Hom the first votary of Ormuzd, Hom, who stands in the same relation to Zoroaster that Abraham does to Moses, as worshipping Ormuzd on the mountains: and accounts the consecration of "high places" to religious uses as among the acts most pleasing to the earth, and therefore to Ormuzd.⁸ In India, according to Dubois, scarce a mountain is to be found on which is a well or fountain that is

⁴ Of the negroes of the Gold Coast: "Ils s'imaginent que les plus hautes montagnes, celles d'où ils voient sortir les éclairs, sont la résidence de leurs dieux. Ils y portent des offrandes."—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. iv, p. 161.

⁵ Compare Gesenius v. dem Götterberge im Norden. 1te. Beylage. Comment. über d. Jesaiah.

⁶ "Hoang-ti assigna quatre montagnes aux quatre côtés de ses états, pour être désormais comme

des lieux sacrés au culte religieux de toute la nation."—*Mém. des Chinois*, vol. ii, p. 35. *Antiq. des Chinois*.

⁷ "Dans les commencemens de la monarchie on consacroit un Kiao, on érigeoit un Tau sur une colline, sur la première éminence," &c.—*Id. ib.* p. 16.

⁸ Vide Ha ix, *Zend.* vol. i, p. 112; Fargard ii, *Id.* p. 279. To the question: "Quelle est la seconde chose qui plaise à cette terre?"

not surmounted by some temple.⁹ In Grecian mythology, every lofty hill is a hill of Jove;¹ and Palestine has its Bethel, its house of God, where the people go up and ask counsel of God, and afterwards its Zion, on which all sacrifice must be offered, all great feasts celebrated.

Verses 10 and 20. Scarcely two centuries have elapsed since a terrible calamity dispersed and for ever separated the great family of mankind; and yet in that short space,—for what are two centuries in the life of Humanity?—several cities have risen up round the ruins of Babylon; and of those of the earth's inhabitants, whom their fears drove to more distant lands, *some* have settled themselves in Sidon,² and *others* have built Damascus, and Salem, and Sodom and Gomorrah, and Gerar, &c. And these men have not only found time to begin and complete these great works, which, because the confusion of tongues dissolved society and reduced all knowledge to individual acquirements, presuppose, with a certain degree of culture, the invention also of many of the more useful and necessary arts: but they have at the same time ascertained, that it is easier to take from others than to labour for one's self; they have raised robbery to a science; they have learned to *oppress* and *protect* each other; they have discovered the advantage of alliances offensive and defensive. With them the arts of peace have flourished,—not as with us,—in periods of security only, but in troublous times also, when they must have

Ormuzd answers: "Si un homme puissant et juste donne des lieux sains et élevés aux prêtres," &c... and Herod. lib. i, § cxxxi.

⁹ "Il est peu de montagnes où se trouve un puits ou une source qui ne soient surmontées par quelque édifice consacré au culte religieux."—Mœurs des Indes, vol. ii, p. 343.

¹ Feithiii Antiq. Hom. p. 22, from Melanthe: παν δε ορος του Διως ορος ονομαζεται επει εθος ην τοις παλαιοις, υψιστη οντι τω θεω εν υψει θυσιας ποιεισθαι: "Omnis

autem mons Jovis mons vocatur, quoniam mos erat apud antiquos, summo Deo in summitate sacrificia faceri."

² Vide Judges xx. 18, 26; xxi. 2; and compare with it 1 Samuel x. 3. On a mountain too it is that Abraham offers his son Isaac in sacrifice; on a hill Jacob also sacrifices, &c.

³ "And Canaan begat Sidon, his first-born" (Chap. x. 15.), compare with chap. xii. 6: "And the Canaanite was then in the land."

lived with their arms in their hands, to resist the dominion or the predatory excursions of their neighbours.⁴

But why dwell on these cities, when kingdoms already exist. China is now a nation. That China, which for so many centuries was a fabled land for civilized Europe, has already been discovered, is already inhabited; its woods are cut down, its plains intersected with dykes, and its rivers covered with boats; the height of its mountains is scientifically ascertained, and its lands are divided into provinces.⁵ But the annals of China are perhaps in our eyes forgeries. Well then Genesis itself knows of Tidal king of nations, and of Elam, and of Egypt. Yes, Egypt appears, already a country fertile and well cultivated and liberally governed; already it boasts the splendour of the Pharaohs, and is rich in gold and silver, and already it has erected⁶ monuments which are the admiration and the wonder even of this age.

Now with the view we have thought ourselves obliged to take of the Babylonian legend, these pictures of society are impossible. For as individuals then forgot the language they once spoke,—as they heard around them languages

⁴ Vide chap. xiv.

⁵ Yu (who lived from 2255 B. C. to 2049) thus describes his services after the great inundation of China: "Alors j'employai les quatre Toni (barques pour les rivières, voitures, &c.), je suivis les montagnes, et je coupai le bois. Avec Y je fis des provisions de grain et de chair d'animaux pour faire subsister les peuples. Dans les neuf parties du monde je ménageai des lits pour les rivières, et je les fis couler vers les quatre mers. Au milieu des campagnes je creusai des canaux pour communiquer avec les rivières. Aidé de Tsi, j'ensemenciai les terres, et à force de travail on eut tiré de quoi vivre. On joignit la chair des animaux à celle des poissons, et les peuples avoient de quoi subsister. Par mon attention, je vins à bout de faire transporter des provisions

dans les endroits qui en manquoient, et en ayant fait des amas je fis faire des échanges; ainsi l'on eut partout des grains. Ensuite on fit la division des départemens, on leur donna une forme de gouvernement."—Chou-king, c. v, p. 35; and in note to § ix, p. 52, id. we are informed from the Tchou-pey, one of the most ancient books of China, that "Yu, avec la connoissance du triangle et du rectangle, et celles des propriétés, put mesurer les montagnes et les profondeurs," &c.

⁶ The great pyramid and the pyramids to the north of Memphis were built by Suphis and his brother Sesuphis, about 2120 B. C. "and the tombs in their vicinity may have been built or cut in the rock shortly after their completion."—Vide Wilkinson's Egypt, vol. i, p. 19 and 41.

they understood not,—they necessarily looked each upon his neighbours as madmen, and scared and terrified they rushed away one from the other, and hid themselves in the woods and caves, from which they came forth stealthily, and only to supply their most urgent necessities. They sank into the darkest barbarism, and centuries must have passed away ere society could be again reconstructed and raised to its former height of development. We will therefore suppose the miracle of miracles, a confusion of tongues which affected not individuals, but families. And then as each family wandered forth, we can well conceive that when any family, possessing within itself individuals acquainted with the more useful and necessary arts, settled down in some favourable spot, that it might within a very short period so increase in numbers, as to merit for its habitation the name of a city. And we can also understand, that for the sake of self-government, or to resist the marauding expeditions of those other families who sought to subsist on the labour of others rather than their own, it chose out from among its members the most worthy to be its chief or king, its leader in war, its judge in peace. So far the story has possibility. But Egypt also is there; and remember now the length of the way: that from Babylon to the plains of the Delta is an hitherto untravelled country; that the wandering family having no particular, no known destination, rested in every fertile valley and lingered near the banks of every stream; and that years therefore probably passed away ere it reached its future home. And then to drain and clear away the luxuriant earth, and to protect itself from the noxious animals which infest the land, is its first occupation, its one care.⁷ In the course of time however new-born generations have increased its numbers. They have spread

⁷ How difficult a task this must have proved we may gather from the fact that centuries after, the Elohim refuses immediately to drive out the nations before the

million of Israelites, lest the beasts of the field increase upon them.—Deut. vii. 22. Diodorus shows us the first Egyptian forging arms to destroy the wild beasts. (Lib. i, § 15.)

themselves over the country; their rich harvests have set them above the fear of famine; the arts they brought with them they now begin to cultivate and to improve; they have built cities, but they still retain the unity of the family; they acknowledge the supremacy of the capital;⁸ they have become a nation. All this however improbable is just possible; and to fill up the measure of our suppositions we may add that the architect of the Babylonian tower may have planned the pyramids, and the people whose ancestors willingly built the one may also superstitiously have toiled at the other.

But this nation which is one family, and knows itself to be one family (for the cotemporaries of Nimrod, the original colonizers, are still living), has either chosen or been compelled to acknowledge a sovereign, one with whose birth and parentage⁹ it is acquainted, and who nevertheless wears a sacred title,¹ and is surrounded by all the pomp and circumstance which wait upon king-descended monarchs. For he appears not as wise in council or able in war, not as one whose personal worth had raised him to rank and station and given him authority, but as one guarded from vulgar eyes by his court, his princes, who obsequiously flatter his vices and pander to his appetites. In two centuries then, when life was extended to four, men under favourable circumstances may have made great and unheard of progress in the arts; but it is inconceivable to me how within the space of *half* a generation, they could forget their equality of birth, and their sovereign acquire his divine right of rule. This tower of Babel, which ever way we view it, is surrounded with difficulties.

Verses 11 and 12. Abraham, judging from his request

⁸ This is contrary to fact: "Quot urbes, tot reges, quemadmodum Ægyptus, priscis hisce temporibus inter diversos distributa est regulos." —Marsham, Canon. Chron. p. 74.

⁹ What was the cry against Christ: "Is not this the carpenter's son?" Men half barbarous have

much less respect for personal than for ancestral worth.

¹ "Pharaoh," according to Wilkinson and Rosellini, is the Coptic word "Phrah," the Sun; and see Jablonsky, *Pantheon Ægypti*. vol. i, lib. ii, c. i, § viii, p. 136, and compare Schumann in *Genesis* ad h. l.

to Sarah, seems to have been well aware of all the value and all the danger of beauty; of its value when it is regarded as something we may not be unwilling to part with; of its danger when it appears as something we have appropriated and must guard with our lives. For his sister's sake, Abraham was courted, feasted and loaded with presents; for his wife's, he would have been either thrown into prison or poniarded or poisoned.

Verse 15. How much may this little verse intend! Of how large a picture may these be the faint outlines! The princes of Egypt are struck by the beauty of Sarah: but they are courtiers—they know no passion but that of gain—they feel no desire but that of standing well with their king,—and to his presence they hurry; they tell him of the fair stranger; they speak of her with the warmth of lovers; their words burn though their hearts be cold; they are poets in her praise, and the devoted slaves of their sovereign. And what is their object, what their motive? They seek to supplant some favourite sultana or to supply her loss; to give to a Maintenon the place of a Montespan, or to find a Barry for a Pompadour, and thus to work their way to court honours, court favours and court pensions. In these princes of Pharaoh we may see the prototypes of the titled valets of the fourteenth and fifteenth Louis; and in this short verse, the character of the court memoirs of the seventeenth century.

Verse 16. Abraham is a nomad and possesses a nomad's wealth. Of the size of his herds and flocks we may form some conception from those which now belong to Arab and Tartar families.² Pallas describing the Sægai Tartars informs us that the rich among them have from eighty to a hundred horses, as many cows, and several hundred sheep: while the poor have but from ten to twenty head

² Reise durch d. Russ. Reich. vol. 14; of Job's wealth, Job i. 2; though iii. p. 348. See also the account of we must remember that Job was no Jacob's present to Esau, ch. xxxiii. nomad, ch. xxxi. 32-34.

of cattle. Buckhardt³ enumerates the wealth of an Arab whose guest he was. "The family of my host," he says, "possessed four horses, three mules, about five hundred sheep, one hundred and fifty goats, six cows and eight camels. *He is looked upon as in easy circumstances: there are few persons whose property does not amount to half so much, and there are many who have three or four times more cattle.*" And Anquetil du Perron⁴ tells us of some wandering Boyades who are employed as carriers in the Dekhan, that they had with them from five to six hundred oxen, the greater number of which carried merchandise and provisions, the rest were for the women and the guides. Their other property consisted of buffaloes and asses.

Abraham we may observe differed from the Arabs of the present day in that he possessed no horses, though asses and camels. Was then the horse—for to suppose that Abraham, who was rich in camels,⁵ had no horses because horses are unsuited to the hilly country of Palestine, is absurd—was the horse, a sacred animal in Persia⁶ and found in the oldest Egyptain paintings, unknown to Abraham? And, as it is mentioned in the funeral of Jacob, had it in the intervals between his visit to Egypt and the death of Jacob been first trained and become a domestic animal? Or is the absence of the horse in this catalogue of the wealth of Abraham to be accounted for, by the natural antipathy that he, a man essentially of peace, must have felt for an animal which in these ancient times was used only in war?⁸

³ Buckhardt, Syria, Appendix, p. 639.

⁴ Preface to the Zend, p. 223. Dubois of the Indian nomad says, "Leurs chefs ont quelquefois des troupeaux de bétail considérables, consistant en bœufs, buffles et ânes. Ils voyagent par bandes de dix, vingt, trente familles."—Dubois, Mœurs des Indes, vol. i. p. 83.

⁵ Volney says of the camel, "Nature has lined his foot with a lump of flesh, which, sliding in the

mud, and being no way adapted to climbing, fits him only for a dry level and sandy soil, &c."—Travels in Egypt and Syria, vol. i. p. 272.

⁶ The horse appears in the Zend as the third (incarnation?) of Bahman (Carde III. vol. ii. p. 288); he watches over the earth during two hours of the night. (Carde, vol. xii. p. 292.) &c.

⁷ Wilkinson's Egypt, vol. i. ch. ii. p. 335, &c.

⁸ Compare Deut. xvi. 16. Ob-

Verse 17. From the very first the Israelites are the guests of Egypt, and from the very first they dupe the Egyptians with falsehoods, and bring on them great plagues.

Verse 18. Though Pharaoh is thus indignant at a falsehood which might have occasioned him to commit a crime, it is by no means certain, that that indignation is not the consequence, rather of the plagues with which his house is visited, than of any right feelings of justice and hospitality.

Diodorus⁹ asserts that the Egyptians contrary to the rest of mankind intermarried with their sisters; I think Pharaoh's observation, which implies, that, because Sarah was Abraham's sister, it was impossible that she should be his wife, rather justifies De Pauw's¹ conjecture, that the marriage of brother and sister was, not an Egyptian, but, a Macedonian custom.

This chapter is the first which makes the Deity² to appear. It is written with the name Jehovah, and, in the only one point in which it can be compared with, differs from, the preceding chapter, with the name Elohim: for *the one* makes the migration of Abraham into Canaan the consequence of a divine warning, while *the other* shows

serve also that the horse is not to be found in the catalogue of Job's wealth; ut sup. that however it was known to him (vide the description, chap. xxxix. 19), &c.; and observe, that that description is of an animal used in war; and remember the Telmessians' explanation of a certain prodigy to Cræsus, in which they say of the horse, πολεμιον τε και επηλυδα, Herod. lib. i. § 78.

⁹ Diod. book i. p. 166, from Marsham Canon Chron. p. 67.

¹ Sur les Egyptiens et Chinois. See however the opposite testimony of Pausanias, speaking of Ptolemy Philadel. i. chap. vii. p. 25, § i.; and also Levit. xviii. 3, from which it

would seem as if the laws there enacted relating to marriage between kindred, were in opposition to the customs of Egypt, Canaan, &c. I never heard, however, that in Egypt a son was permitted to marry his mother, or a father his daughter.

² Φασι δε τους πεντε Θεους τους προειρημενους πασαν την οικουμηνην επιπορευεσθαι, φανταζομενους τοις ανθρωποις εν ιςρων ζωων μορφαις, εστι δε οτε εις ανθρωπων ιδεας η των αλλων μεταβαλλοντας. και τουτο μη μυθῶδες ὑπαρχειν, αλλα δυνατον, ειπερ οὔτοι προς αληθειαν εισι οι παντα γεννωντες.—Diod. lib. i. § 12, of the Egyptians. See also Homer's Odys. xvii. 485

it us as the consequence of a resolution which had been previously formed by Terah Abraham's father.

With this chapter we may connect

i. All the promises subsequently made to the Hebrew people.

1st. Of possession of the Holy Land.

2nd. Of national greatness, and

3dly. Of national greatness under the rule of the Messiah. Isaiah, chap. lx. &c.

ii. The opinion so prevalent among the Jews, that all who injure the loved of God, God punishes; an opinion exemplified by the plagues with which at various times Pharaoh and his people are afflicted; by the vengeance with which Babylon, Edom, &c. are threatened. Vide Isaiah; Ezek. xxv, 13; Obadiah, &c.

iii. Not only the opinion that the same crimes are more heinous, when they are committed against God's people, than when they are committed against indifferent persons: but also this other opinion, that God's people are permitted to act as they will, are without any moral conscience, have only to consult their own interests, in their dealings with God's or their own enemies. Thus Abraham's lies to Pharaoh are held guiltless; thus Moses and the captive Israelites cheat their confiding hosts and glory in the deed³—and thus David repays the protection of Achish by treachery the most base, but spares Israel and is without reproach.⁴ 1 Sam. xxvii.

iv. The sojourn of Abraham in Egypt as typical of that of the Israelites.

“Quel est donc votre Fetiche? demanda Villault: c'est, lui dirent-ils, un gros chien noir *qui se fait voir au pied d'un grand arbre.*”—Hist. Gén. des Voy. vol. iv. p. 167, Gold Coast Negroes.

³ Exod. xii.

⁴ These narrow views of duty and morality, though they express themselves in this form only among the Jews and the Christians, are not especially Jewish, they belong

to man ignorant and barbarous. Thus, “Un nègre qui vole un autre nègre est regardé parmi eux avec détestation. *Mais ils ne se figurent pas de crime à voler les Européens. Ils font gloire au contraire de les avoir trompés; et c'est aux yeux de leur nation une preuve d'esprit et d'adresse.*”—Vide Histoire Generale des Voyages, vol. iii. p. 97. Des Nègres de la Côte d'Or.

CHAPTER XI.

GENESIS xiii. Verses 1—18.

Verses 1 and 2. “And Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver and in gold.” This is the first mention of the precious metals. In the preceding chapter, we were told of Abraham’s sheep and oxen and maid servants and men servants: now however that he has visited Egypt, the El Dorado¹ of the olden world, and been well-entreated there for his wife’s sake, he possesses also silver and gold.

Gold and silver and copper are the metals, which, because they are found in a pure or nearly pure state, are the most easily worked and the most easily applied to useful purposes. Thus in some parts of Africa, on their first discovery, the javelins of the natives were pointed with silver. In Mexico and Peru,³ gold and silver were not merely worn as ornaments but also used for various household utensils. Among Herodotus’s Ethiopians, the fetters of the common prison were of gold. And the

¹ “That the riches of the country were immense, is proved by the appearance of the furniture and domestic utensils, and by the great quantity of jewels, of gold, silver, precious stones.....in use among them in the earliest times.....their treasures became proverbial among the neighbouring states,” &c.—Wilkinson’s *Ancient Egyptians*, vol. i. p. 232.

² “Les hommes avoient quatre longues javelines garnies de pointes d’argent.”—*Voyage des Hollandois*, vol. i. p. 237. And, though on the

gold-coast we find gold an article of commerce and of luxury (for already it purchases honours, already expiates almost every crime), its estimation is probably owing to long commerce with Europeans.—*Vide Hist. Gen. des Voyages*, vol. iv. p. 120, 177, and 193.

³ See the description of the temple of the sun, *Hist. des Yncas*, p. 174.

⁸ Herodotus, lib. iii. § 23. The Scythians also used gold only: they used neither silver nor brass, *id. lib. iv. §. 71.*

earliest Egyptians, according to Diodorus,⁵ manufactured the precious metals first into arms for the purpose of exterminating the wild beasts with which their country was infested, and afterwards into implements of agriculture, and lastly into statues and temples of the gods.

But poor indeed is, and must ever remain, the nation, whose knowledge of metals is confined to gold and silver. They are too rare—except in those distant ages of which we know nothing and those countries which are yet undiscovered—and too soft to be of any great use for the common purposes of life, and copper or brass accordingly seems to have been very early substituted for them. For of brass all sacred instruments were made: it was besides used for swords, armour, &c.;⁶ indeed the ancient nations seem to have possessed, like the Peruvians,⁷ the art of hardening it which we have lost, for among them it held the place which iron does with us.

As regards iron: though silver and gold are mentioned for the first time in connexion with the name of Abraham, while *according to the Zendavesta* the uses and properties of iron

⁵ Diodorus, lib. i, c. xv.

⁶ "Among the antients brass, not iron, was the metal of most use. In their little scythes, where-with they cut their herbs for enchantment, their priests' razors, plough-shares, for describing the content of plotted cities, their musick instruments and such like, how special this metal was, it is with good warrant delivered. Nor with less how frequent in the making of swords, spears, and armours, in the heroic times, &c."—Selden, notes to Drayton's Polyolbion, song 6, Works, vol. iii; and Herod. lib. ii. ch. 37.

⁷ "Les Péruviens ne savoient pas forger le fer, et l'on n'a pas trouvé dans leur pays un seul instrument de ce métal, l'âme des métiers et des arts; mais en revanche ils possédoient le secret que nous avons laissé perdre dans notre continent,

de donner au cuivre une trempe pareille à celle que reçoit l'acier."—De Pauw, Américains, vol. iii, p. 181. The Egyptian tools used in the granite quarries were of bronze.—Wilkinson's Egyptians, vol. iii, p. 252; and for the uses to which they put brass, id. p. 253.

"Il est dit que Meschia et Meschiane firent un trou dans la terre. Ils y trouvèrent le fer, le frappèrent avec la pierre, et en firent une hache: ils frappèrent au pied d'un arbre, le coupèrent, et arrangèrent les parties," &c.—Boun-Dehesch, Zend, vol. ii, p. 279. Sanchoniatho makes the sons of the inventors of hunting and fishing the discoverers of iron, and first workers of it: σιδηρου ευρετας, και της τουτου εργαστας.—Cory's Fragments, p. 7. It is known also to Job: "Iron is taken out of the earth, and brass is molten out of the stone."—xxviii. 2.

were known to the first pair, and *according to Genesis* its manufacture was an antediluvian art; yet besides the testimonies of several ancient nations as to its late discovery, there is something in the very nature of iron which induces us to regard it as one of the last metals which man learned to appropriate. For, even where iron most abounds, where it exists in its purest form, it will lie long unnoticed,—to the vulgar eye it seems but a blackish gravel:⁸ there is nothing to distinguish it from the stones around, but its weight; and to speculate on its properties from its weight presupposes some knowledge of metals. Again, after the gravel or the rock has been ascertained to be metallic, you must fuse the metal. Now after a single fusion, gold, silver, and copper are fit for all ordinary purposes—not so iron: it comes forth from the furnace hard and brittle as a stone. It must be again applied to the fire, and when at the point of fusion beaten with hammers, and this again and again, till it at length becomes plastic and malleable.⁹ So complicated a process must necessarily have retarded the use of iron long after its discovery.¹

Verse 3. Abraham returns to Bethel, and there a second time calls upon the name of the Lord. Bethel was a holy place; God's house.² *Here* appeared the ladder which, in Jacob's dream, united earth to Heaven; here stood, in after times, the ark of the covenant (Judges xv, 27); and

⁸ At New Zealand, "On trouva une grande quantité de sable ferrugineux, qui avoit été jetté sur la côte par tous les petits ruisseaux d'eau douce qui viennent de l'intérieur du pays.....Cependant les habitants de ce canton, ainsi que ceux des autres parties de la côte, ne connoissent point l'usage de ce métal."—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. xx, p. 448.

⁹ Gouget, *Origine des Lois*, vol. i, p. 147.

¹ The Peruvians, *e. g.* seem to have known the metallic properties

of iron, and yet were unable to work it.—Vide supra, Deluge, note ⁸, p. 213. The same appears to have been the case with the inhabitants of Madagascar.—*Voyages des Hollandais*, vol. i, p. 230. In Egypt, however, so early as the times of Remeses III and his grandfather, from 1269 to 1235 B.C., we learn, from the tombs at Thebes, that steel was in use. Wilkinson says of the weapons painted on the walls, that "their blue colour proves them to have been of steel."—Thebes, p. 111

² Beth-el, the house of God.

here, the people came to consult the oracles of God. (Judges xxi, 2, and 1 Sam. x, 3.) Here too Samuel stayed in his circuit to judge Israel; and here seem to have dwelt the sons of the prophets. (1 Sam. vii, 23, and x, 5.) The great part which Bethel thus plays in the early period of Hebrew story, contrasted with the disgrace and abomination afterwards brought upon it by Israel's idolatrous worship there of the golden calves of Jeroboam³ and the hatred subsequently shown by the Jews for the once holy place,⁴ is assuredly some evidence that these books which magnify its sanctity were at the very least compiled from traditions that existed previous to the separation of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

Verse 5. Tents are an antediluvian invention—and they are of various kinds. Thus the Fuegian⁵ tent or hut is made of the interwoven branches of trees; the Hindoo⁶ is of bamboo or hosier, and portable; the Samoede and Tartar⁷ is of the bark of trees, sewed together, and covered over with skins; the Bedouin⁸ according to Joinville is formed of hoops and stakes over which are thrown sheep-

³ 1 Kings xii. 29, &c.; Amos vii. 10, &c.

⁴ 2 Kings xxiii. 15, &c.; Hosea iv. 15; Jeremiah xlviii. 13, &c.

⁵ Vide Voyage of the Adventure and Beagle, vol. i, p. 75.

⁶ "Ils logent toujours sous des tentes d'osier ou de bambou, qu'ils portent partout. Chaque famille a sa tente, longue de sept ou huit pieds, large de quatre ou cinq, et haute de trois ou quatre, dans lesquelles les pères, les mères, les enfans, les poules, et quelquefois les cochons, logent, ou plutôt s'entassent pêle-mêle." Dubois, Mœurs des Indes, vol. i. p. 83.

⁷ "Leur tentes (Samojèdes) composées de morceaux d'écorce d'arbres, cousus ensemble, et couverts de quelque peaux de rennes, sont dressées en forme pyramidale sur

des bâtons de moyenne grosseur." (Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 504.) "Die Jurten (der Tataren) oder Gezelte sind mit Filzen überzogen."—Pallas Reise, vol. ii, p. 81. In winter, however, "Sie mit Birkenrinden ihre Jurten bekleiden."—Id. vol. iii, p. 404.

⁸ "Ces Bédouins ne demeurent ni en ville ni en cité, mais gisent toujours aux champs et en déserts. Et quant il fait mauvais temps, eux, leurs femmes et enfans, fichent en terre une façon de habitacle, qui est fait de tonnes et de cercles liés à des perches, ainsi que font les femmes à sécher les buées, et sur ces cercles et perches gesticent des peaux de grans moutons.....courroyées en allum."—Joinville, Mém. de St. Loys, vol. i, p. 256.

skins prepared with alum; while according to later travellers⁹ it is of wool or goat's hair dyed black,—of cloth in a word: and the Mogul imperial tent is of a white stuff, and so large as to contain two thousand persons.¹

From the Fuegian tent to the Mogul, there is a long interval. Of what kind were the tents of the patriarchs? They were *of some value*, for they form a part of Lot's possessions: *portable*, for Abraham *removes* his tent: and *small*, for the principal members of a family have each one his or her own tent; as Sarah, Leah, Rachel, and the maid-servants. They consisted probably *of but one apartment*,² for the camel furniture in the same *chamber* with the sick Rachel excites no suspicion; and that apartment, save perhaps in the rainy season, *seems to have been used for sleeping merely*, for Abraham receives and *entertains* the three strangers without his tent at Mamre.

As to the material of which these tents were formed, we may guess at it from the purpose for which the tents were intended. In the summer they served to protect the wanderer as well from the heat of noon as from the dews of night; and in the winter they sheltered him from the rain: we may therefore presume that they were not of linen, which would scarcely answer any one of these purposes,³ but that they were made either of skins such as the Tartar, or of a dark woollen or hair stuff such as the Bedouin, tents. And that they were rather like the latter, which are no modern invention if they are indeed alluded to in the Song of Solomon,⁴ we are inclined to

⁹ Arabs of Africa. "Sie wohnen in Gezelten, die aus grober Wolle, oder Ziegen Haare verfertiget sind, und schwarz gefärbet werden"—Hösts, Marokos und Fes; Michaelis, Orient. Bib. vol. xix, p. 71.

¹ "Cinq jours après il les fit conduire à la cour de sa mère, où ils trouvèrent une tente d'étoffe blanche, capable de contenir deux mille personnes."—Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. vii, p. 252.

² According to Neibuhr, some of

the Bedouin tents have two or even three apartments.—Michaelis, Orient. Bib. vol. vii, p. 29.

³ It will protect from the night dews. The English, of European nations, for some time alone retained the use of tents in military expeditions. The Prussians however, of late have found the night air in bivouacking so prejudicial, that they have returned to them.

⁴ "I am black but comely.....as the tents of Kedar."—Chap. i. 5.

think, from the fact, that the Bedouins besides claiming a descent from Abraham inhabit the same climate, and wander over the same tracts of country that did the patriarchs. In this case the patriarchal tent would imply a certain culture, a certain degree of civilization; for it proves that man has learned to economize his resources, and to apply the skins of animals for instance to a double use, the hair or wool to weave into stuff, and the skin to make into leather.

But how and when is the existence of any art an evidence of civilization? When the South American Indian covers himself with the barks of trees sewed together with roots, and the Ostiack⁴ weaves the fibres of nettles into curtains; when the native Chilian⁵ makes cloth of the long wool of his sheep, and the savage of Madagascar⁶ manufactures the cotton that grows wild on his woods; we perceive that though a certain degree of thought has been exercised, it has been exercised only on the nearest objects, and only to meet the exigences and wants of daily life; and we conclude that even the savage has his arts. When however we learn that the hard bark of the American becomes a warm and pliable cloth in the hands of the Otaheitan, and that that cotton which is so coarsely manufactured in Madagascar is by the Carabee⁷ and the Gambia⁸ negro made up into stuffs which excite the admiration even of the European; when we know that the barbarous Germans⁹ were clad in linen, and that the state robes of

⁴ "Les femmes Ostiaques s'occupent encore à préparer et à filer de certaines orties, elles en font de la toile et des rideaux," &c.—Hist. Gén. des Voy. vol. xviii, p. 678.

⁵ "Les habitans du Chili ont des vêtements faits de la laine, que leur fournissent certains brebis, qui ont le lainage si long qu'il pend jusqu'à terre."—Voyages Holland. vol. ii, p. 43.

⁶ Les femmes de Madagascar à filer et à trestre de la toile de coton."—Voy. Hol. vol. i, p. 231.

⁷ Lafitau, speaking of the materials which several savage nations make up into stuffs, says: "Tels sont les deux ou trois sortes de cotonniers dont les femmes des Caraïbes font les beaux lits de coton qu'on nomme Hamacs."—Mœurs des Sauvages, vol. ii, p. 160.

⁸ The red cloth of the Gambia negroes is much esteemed.—Hist. Gén. des Voyages, vol. iii, p. 184.

⁹ "Il est surprenant," says De Pauw, "que chez des nations qui paroissent avoir été plongées dans

ancient China were embroidered with divers colours of needle-work,¹ sun and moon and stars and birds and trees and flowers and serpents: we perceive, that thought has been exercised not merely to satisfy the most crying necessities, but to please the eye and increase the comforts of men; and we then have a state of society, in advance of savage life certainly, and in advance of it just in proportion to the number of arts which that society possesses; but nevertheless a state of society which can yet lay no just claim to civilization. For, if the mere possession, that is the exercise, of an art or of many arts be proof of a country's civilization: then the civilization of any country may be represented by its artizans, ever among its rudest, and save in so far as their several arts are concerned, among its most uncultivated, classes. *Not* therefore the mere possession of arts; and *not* therefore, that merely manual dexterity in the arts, and that nicety of execution by which many nations are distinguished, and which are the *certain* and *early*, though also the *highest*, results of a constitution of castes, are evidences of civilization,—but rather, that which first gave life to all art, the thought that is at work among a people, and which, in so far as the arts are concerned, manifests itself in continued improvements, in the simplification of complicated processes, in the adaptation to use of hitherto neglected objects, in the economising of time, labour, and material,—in a word, its advance, its progress, in the arts is the surest proof that a society, if not yet civilised, possesses at least within itself the principle of civilization.

Verses 6-18. The Nomad has his customs, laws, and property. The Bedouin travels not without star or com-

une grande barbarie, comme les Thraces et les Germains, la culture du lin et la filage eussent fait des progrès qui supposent une industrie bien supérieure à celle qu'on porte ordinairement à ces peuples." *Recherches Philosophiques sur les Grecs*, vol. i, p. 307.

¹ Vide Chou-king, chap. v. The Emperor Chun thus addresses his ministers: "Si lorsque je vois la figure *des anciens habits*.....sur lesquels le soleil, la lune, les étoiles, les signes, les montagnes, les serpents, et les oiseaux de diverses couleurs soient représentés," &c.

pass nor without an object, whithersoever a vagrant will may hurry him—he has certain appointed stations, certain districts, in which from time immemorial his ancestors² have at certain periods of the year been accustomed to pitch their tents. To his own plains he restricts himself; he looks upon them as his patrimony; and though they are guarded by neither hedge nor ditch, as his patrimony are they respected by neighbouring tribes.³ Now what does Moses? He shows the Israelites that in Canaan *their* fathers were wont to dwell,—that, unmolested by its city populations, they had occupied its pastures, dug wells in its plains, and built altars on its mountains,—and that

* “Each of the Bedouin tribes appropriates to itself a certain tract of land: in this they do not differ from cultivated nations, except that their territory requires a greater extent in order to furnish subsistence for their herds throughout the year.....and as the entire space is necessary for the annual subsistence of the tribe, whoever encroaches upon it is deemed a violator of property; this is with them the law of nations. If therefore a tribe, or any of its subjects, *enter upon a foreign territory, they are treated as enemies and robbers, and a war breaks out.*” *—Volney, Syria, c. xxiii. Again: “The valley of the Jordan affords pasturage for numerous tribes of Bedouins. Some remain the whole year, *considering it as their patrimony*, others visit it in winter.”—Buckhardt, Syria, p. 346. So also the North American Indians: “Among them, with no ideas of individual property in land, each tribe possesses a right derived from the most remote antiquity, to certain regions over which they hunt in common,

and remove their tents or wigwams from one location to another, according as the animals on which they feed.....happen to be abundant or scarce.”—*Morning Herald*, November 1837.

3 “The desert of Suez is never inhabited by Bedouin encampments, though it is full of rich pasture, and pools of water during the winter and spring. No strong tribes frequent the eastern borders of Egypt, and a weak isolated encampment would soon be stripped by nightly robbers. *The ground itself is the patrimony of no tribe, but is common to all, which is contrary to the general practice of the desert, where every district has its own acknowledged owners, with its limits of separation from those of the neighbouring tribes, although it is not always occupied by them.*”—Buckhardt, Syria, p. 462; and Sale, of the literature of the Arabs, says, “In their poems were preserved the distinction of descents, the rights of tribes, and the propriety of language.”—Prelim. Discourse to Koran, p. 36.

* Inattention to or ignorance of this peculiarity of the Arabs was the cause of the late war between the Arabs and the French. The Duke of Orleans out of curiosity passed the boundary-line of the territory ceded to the French. He thus declared war against Abd-el-Kedr.

therefore, according to nomad law and custom, the land was their's, and as their's it seems to have been regarded during the long sojourn in Egypt.⁴ Moses, in short, shows his people that they had a nomad right to Canaan.

But, besides a *nomad*, Moses claims for the Israelites a *divine*, right to the country. It is theirs by a patent received from their God himself. He promised it to their fathers, and promised it to them even while the Canaanites dwelt there. And as they continued to dwell there when He called upon Israel to take possession, He necessarily called upon Israel to take forcible possession; and either to drive the Canaanites from the country or to extirpate them.

On these claims of the Israelites we may observe, that they were valid for the Israelites; but as this book is held up to our veneration as the book, not of the Israelitish Jehovah, but of the Great God Himself; as it professes to lay open to us the ways of God to man: as it contains the true history of God's secret government of the world: it behoves us to inquire whether these claims are valid in the eyes of Humanity, and accord with the ideas we would form of the acts of a just God.

And 1. As regards the nomad or legal right of Israel, we will observe,

1st. That it was confined to the pasturages, and did not extend to the cities of Canaan. For even if we suppose with Michaelis, that the Israelites were the first discoverers and occupiers⁵ of the country; yet, as they permitted the Canaanites tranquilly to settle there, and to build cities, and to cultivate the soil, they could with far less justice

⁴ Vide the account of the burial of Jacob (chap. l. 7, 13; and Exod. xiii. 19; and also 1 Chron. viii. 24) by which, as Michaelis observes, it would seem as if a granddaughter of Joseph's had built two cities in Canaan, even during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt: and remember also the request of Joseph to be removed to Palestine, when-

ever his descendants should return there.

⁵ Vide Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, § 1: "Rechte der Israeliten an Palestine." From Gen. xi. 31, Michaelis concludes that the Israelites dwelt in Canaan from the time of Eber; while chap. xii. 6 implies that at that early period the Canaanites were not yet in the land.

reclaim a territory to which centuries of undisturbed possession had given its inhabitants a title, than could, at this day, the native Indians the many cities and cultivated fields of civilized America.

And 2ndly. That this right was lost during the long sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. According to Michaelis,⁶ the Canaanites, whatever may have been their vices, appear to have been at the least a just people. For several centuries they respected the burial places and the acquired property of Israel: and what more could man expect of them? Who is so mad as to assert, that they should either have permitted their rich plains to remain unenclosed and uncultivated, or that before occupying them they should at least have sent some embassy to obtain the permission of the Israelites? Among civilized nations, *individuals*, even though they may not claim property, retain all their rights to it until a certain conventional period has expired: and the property which Israel as an individual, as a family, possessed in Canaan, was never trespassed upon. But as the only title which any people have even to their native land is the occupation of its soil, it is clear that Israel, as *a people*, lost all claim to Canaan as their possession, the instant they *en masse* voluntarily quitted the country.⁷

As regards the *divine right* of the Israelites, founded on the divine promises, we may observe,

1st. That such a right may be set up by any class of men or any nation, to the prejudice of other men and other nations. With this right to cheer and encourage their followers, Mohammed and his successors conquered half the then known world; and with this right and the example of the Israelites to palliate their crimes, the

⁶ Mosaisches Recht, vol. i, § 28, p. 118. Michaelis, throughout the whole of his argument, seems to consider only the claims of the Israelites;—he altogether forgets that, in every dispute, there are at the least two parties.

⁷ And such must have been the opinion of the Israelites themselves, if we may judge of it from the manner in which they entertain the claims of Ammon to the land between Arnok and Jabbok. Judges xi. 13, 17.

Spaniards^s depopulated America. And that we may the better feel the absurdity of all such pretensions, we will suppose; that the nomad race of our own country either possessed or imagined some obscure prophecy, some antique rhyme which gave to their tribe the broad lands and fair cities of England; and also that they believed the time now come for them to seize upon their own,—might they not, when we rose up to dispute their pretensions, very fairly ask of us: why, if God once gave an already inhabited country to a gypsy race, should He not again give another? I do not see how we could answer, but I know we should laugh at, them. And even after the prophecy had been justified by the event, we should still assert and feel that, though they might be, not impostors, but deluded fanatics, such a prophecy came not and never could come from God.

2ndly. That the grant of such a right supposes the Deity committing an injustice. If our world be not one of confusion, the ideas of right which God has implanted in man, God Himself observes in His dealings with man. Now Canaan is already occupied, is already the property of a people, and is recognized as their property⁹ even by the ancestors of Israel; and nevertheless the God of Israel, because it is a rich and fair land, promises it to the descendants of His favourite Abraham. And although it is certain that, had the Canaanites voluntarily emigrated to other climes,

^s Without the example of Israel, Mohammed and the Spaniard must, let it be observed, have found some other plea for their ambition. Mohammed received his commission from the Jewish God himself,—the Spaniard from the Pope, that God's vicegerent. The one and the other, however—for we improve still—go forth, not to conquer lands only, but to spread the knowledge of the true faith. They extirpate those only who *will not* be saved. (Vide Sale's, Prelim. Dis. to Koran, pp. 56, 57.) The Israelites, on the other hand, professed no mission of

salvation; they went forth merely to acquire lands and beeves. As an example of the manner in which the Spaniards executed their mission, we may instance the case of Haiti, which, at its discovery, contained 1,000,000 inhabitants,—sixty years after, 15,000,—and in 1729, the aborigines were extinct. —P. Margat au P. de la Neuville, Let. Edifiantes, vol. vii.

⁹ Vide the account of Abraham's purchase of the field of Ephron (Gen. xxiii.); of Jacob's of a field of Hamor (xxxiii), to build an altar to the Elohim there.

the Hebrews might then, without any reproach, any shadow of injustice, have entered into and possessed the country; yet as such was not the case, as the Canaanites clung to the land of their fathers, the holy people were compelled, and were indeed ordered by their God, to drive them from it by force, i. e. to become thieves, robbers, though on so large a scale as would have elicited the admiration even of a Jonathan Wild.

But the Canaanites were destroyed for their crimes. "*Les plus faibles ont toujours tort.*" With the many that which *is*, *is*, not for some reason merely, but *is* because it is right. With them Russia is justified in tearing out the heart of Poland, America in cheating the aboriginal Indians, and the English settler in shooting the Australian savage; like the Mahometans they cry "It is God's will;" and because the strong and powerful are God's instruments, the weak and suffering are they believe God's enemies, wicked men of whose crimes the earth is weary. Such of course were the Canaanites. But if we place not implicit credence in the dark picture which Romans have drawn of Carthaginian manners, shall we in that which Moses gives us of Canaanite vices? Let us remember that when the vices of nations are a plea for their extermination, it is one which hate can always find, or cupidity always invent.

Verse 16. Buckhardt¹ observes "that no nation excels the Bedouins in numerical exaggeration. Ask a Bedouin who belongs to a tribe of three hundred tents of the number of his brethren, and he will take a handful of sand, and cast it up in the air, and point to the stars, and tell you that they are no less." When however we remember that before Mohammed many of the Arab tribes and princes had embraced, *some* Christianity, *others* Judaism,²

¹ Syria, note to p. 560.

² "Christianity had made a very great progress among the Bedouins before Mohammed.....The principal tribes that embraced Christianity were Hamyar, Ghassan," &c. (Sale's Prel. Dis. to Koran, p. 29.)

And again: "Though the Jews were an inconsiderable people in other parts of the world, yet in Arabia they grew very powerful, several tribes and princes embracing their religion" (p. 46), *e. g.* Arab princes appear in Josephus as proselytes.

we may doubt whether this particular mode of speech is original among the Arabs, or whether they borrowed it from the Jewish books.

This chapter, like the preceding, with which it is closely connected, is written with the name Jehovah. Like it, it speaks of the journeys of Abraham and of the altars which he built and the prayers which he offered to the Lord; like it too, it insists on his connexion with Lot, on his riches, and the insufficiency of the land for his support. It mentions besides the amicable separation of Lot and Abraham, and terminates with a second promise similar to, and confirmatory of, the first.

If now we compare together these two promises, we find, that *the first* refers rather to Abraham himself, *the second* to his posterity; and that, though both are in style figurative and poetical, *the one* labours to express the love of Jehovah for Abraham, *the other* to overpower us with the numerical greatness of Abraham's descendants; *the former* is more vague and general, it blesses Abraham and the earth through Abraham; *the latter* more definite and precise, it blesses Abraham in his seed and in the possession of Canaan: *that* therefore may possibly have a *Messiacal* while *this* was limited to a *Judaical* application.

With the separation of Lot and Abraham we may compare that of Esau and Jacob, chapter xxxvi. 7.

With Jehovah bidding Abraham to look out, for all the land which he saw He the Lord would give him (ver. 14-15) we may contrast Satan's third and last temptation of Christ. (Matth. iv. 5.)

With the expressions used to convey a notion of the numbers of Abraham's posterity we may connect the superstitious objection of Joab to number the people of Israel (2 Sam. xxi; 1 Chron. xxi) and the remorse of David for having ordered it (2 Sam. xxiv. 10).

From the fact that the promise of Canaan, &c. is made to Abraham immediately after Lot has quitted him, we learn that Lot had no part in the promise which is recorded in chapter xii.

CHAPTER XII.

GENESIS xiv. 1-24.

Verse 1. When Boemond laid siege to Arsur, William of Tyre records, that from the heights of the mountains of Samaria several kings came down to the plains of Antipatris, bringing with them bread and wine, and dried figs and raisins, as presents to the Christian leader.¹ Such and of about the same power were probably the four chiefs whom the historian here decorates with such pompous titles.

Verses 2-4. This is the first war the sacred history speaks of—though certainly not the first which man had waged against man—"The mighty men which were of old, men of renown," may indeed have been like the heroes of Paganism great by their personal strength and valour, which they devoted to the extinction of wild beasts, or of wilder robbers who pillaged the dwellings and carried away the wives and daughters of the people. Like them too may have been, notwithstanding his name, Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord, whom gratitude perhaps raised to a throne; but not like them could have been Chedorlaomer, for kings were his tributaries, independent states owned and feared his power, "twelve years did five kings serve him." He was one who had already fought battles and gained victories; one who had armies at his command, and a king therefore, who, if he did not rule despotically, ruled at least over some martial people.

¹ Guillaume de Tyr, *Histoire des Croisades*, vol. xvii, livre ix, p. 41; Guizot, *Mém. sur l'Hist. de France*.

Verses 5-12. Chedorlaomer marches against the five cities of Siddim. On his road he lays waste the country; in Siddim itself he meets and joins battle with the rebel forces, he puts them to the rout, and retires with many prisoners and a large booty. The object of this war seems to have been not so much conquest and the extension of dominion, as slaves and plunder: it was properly a predatory excursion,—an expedition, like that of some Highland chieftain, undertaken for the purpose of exacting, and no doubt to have been avoided by, the regular payment of blackmail.

Verses 13-15. Abraham with a band of his servants pursues the conquerors, and overtakes them; and having divided his troops into two bodies, he during the night attacks the enemy's camp in opposite places, puts him to the rout and obtains possession of his baggage and plunder. That these four kings were petty sovereigns I think probable, but we cannot conclude that they were so from the smallness of the force which conquered them.² For the victory was gained by a surprise over a sleeping and secure enemy, and in this way many a small band has routed a large army. For instance, of the Christians of Kerah, who are renowned for their courage, Buckhardt relates "that a party of the Aeneze had on a Sunday, when the men were absent, robbed the encampment of all its cattle; on the first alarm, given by the women, twenty-seven young men pursued the enemy, whom they overtook at a short distance and had the courage to attack, though amounting to upwards of (four hundred men?) on camels, and many of them armed with fire-locks. After a battle of two hours the Rowalla gave way with a loss of forty killed—and of the whole of the booty which they had carried off."³

Verses 16-24. Abraham returns with the prisoners and

² This is argued by Voltaire with a sneer (*Notes sur Génèse*), by Gesenius (*Art. Abraham*, Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclop.*), Michaelis, and others.

³ Buckhardt, *Syria*, p. 382.

the booty. Met and blessed by Melchisedek he gives him tythes of all: he refuses from the king of Sodom any recompense for his services, restores to every man his own, and retains that only which the young men had eaten and the portion of Aner, Eschol, and Mamre who had assisted him.—Where then did Abraham take the tythe which he gave to Melchisedek?

Verse 14. “Abraham arms his trained servants, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen.” Abraham’s encampment must have been like that of some small army. He can take from his servants three hundred and eighteen picked men born in his house, his family slaves, men in whose courage and fidelity he has confidence—and all young and vigorous enough to undertake a rapid, nocturnal and dangerous expedition. His encampment therefore must have comprised the parents of these men, their sisters, wives and children—and besides these, servants also which he had bought with his money, and others which he had received as presents from Pharaoh. It could not have consisted of much less than three thousand souls. The cattle which was required for the support of this multitude, and the camels for carrying the tents, furniture and children, must have been very numerous. If Lot’s possessions at all approached those of Abraham, no wonder they were compelled to separate.

Verse 18. This is the first mention of Jerusalem in Scripture. Nineteen centuries B. C. Salem was a holy city, and its king the priest of the Most High God. Nineteen centuries after Christ, and Salem, many times conquered, many times destroyed, is still El Kods the Holy.

Two modern travellers, men of very different characters and views, Volney and Clarke, thus severally describe their feelings on approaching this city, to which nations have gone in pilgrimage. “Two days’ journey south of Nablous, following the direction of the mountains which gradually become more barren and rocky, we arrive at a

town which presents a striking example of the vicissitudes of human affairs: when we behold its walls levelled, its ditches filled up, and all its buildings embarrassed with ruins, we scarcely can believe we view that celebrated metropolis which formerly baffled the efforts of the most powerful empire;⁴ in a word, we with difficulty recognize Jerusalem. Nor is our astonishment less to think of its ancient greatness, when we consider its situation amid a rugged soil, destitute of water, and surrounded by dry channels of torrents and steep heights. Distant from every great road, it seems to have been neither calculated for a considerable mart of commerce, nor for the centre of a great consumption. It however overcame every obstacle and may be adduced as a proof of what popular opinions may effect in the hands of an able legislature, or when favoured by happy circumstances. The same opinions still preserve to this city *its feeble existence*. The renown of its miracles perpetuated in the East invites and retains a considerable number of inhabitants within its walls. Mahommetans, Christians, Jews, all make it a point to see what they denominate the noble and holy city.⁵

Clarke says: "No sensation of fatigue or heat would counterbalance the eagerness and zeal which animated all our party in the approach to Jerusalem. At length, after about two hours ascending a hill towards the south, 'Hagiopolis!' exclaimed a Greek in the van, and immediately throwing himself from his horse was seen upon his knees, bare-headed, facing the prospect he surveyed. Suddenly the sight burst upon us all. The effect produced was that of total silence throughout the company. Many of our party, by an immediate impulse, took off their hats as if

⁴ By what strange perversity of imagination is it, that a man looking on Jerusalem, one of the most strongly situated cities in the world ("Sa forme est un carré long, et de trois côtés elle est enfermée et défendue par des vallées extrêmement profondes."—Guil. de Tyr. liv. viii)

should think principally of the opposition it made to the Roman arms? Could not Volney feel that it was *not* Jerusalem, the capital of Judea, that was great, *but Jerusalem*, the field and scene of Christ's life and deeds?

⁵ Volney's Travels, vol. ii, p. 196.

entering a church, without being sensible of so doing. The Greeks and Catholics shed torrents of tears; and presently crossing themselves with unfeigned devotion, asked if they might be permitted to take off the covering from their feet and proceed bare-footed to the holy sepulchre. We had not been prepared for the grandeur of the spectacle which the city alone exhibited. Instead of a wretched and ruined town, by some described as the desolated remnant of Jerusalem, we beheld as it were a flourishing and stately metropolis,⁶ presenting a magnificent assemblage of domes, towers, palaces, churches, and monasteries; all of which glittering in the sun's rays, shone with inconceivable splendour. As we drew nearer, our whole attention was engrossed by its interesting and noble appearance."⁷

Melchizidek is a great name in both Jewish and Christian mythology. He is mentioned with honour in Psalm cx: "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizidek." The object of this psalm seems to have been, while it commemorated some victory gained by David's lieutenants, to make of David's absence from the scene of contest an occasion of glory to him. Like Melchizidek, he appears but to receive the conquerors, and to enjoy the fruits of victory. After times, however, gave to this psalm a Messiacal interpretation; and St. Paul, quoting the Septuagint, directly

⁶ Jerusalem, without being perhaps the ruin Volney describes, can never have been of any extraordinary size. Guillaume de Tyr says of it: "Elle est située dans un lieu presque entièrement dépourvu de ruisseaux, de fontaines, de bois, et de pâturages." And shortly after: "Les habitans en sont réduits à ne se servir que des eaux pluviales." Of the fountains without the city, celebrated in Hebrew story, he informs us: "Elles sont peu nombreuses, et ne fournissent d'ailleurs qu'une très petite quantité d'eau."

Of the famous Siloe, he gives no more favourable account: "La source est peu abondante, et jaillit dans le fond de la vallée; elle donne des eaux qui n'ont point de goût, et ne coulent pas toujours; on assure que c'est une fontaine intermittente, et qui ne donne de l'eau que de trois en trois jours."—liv. viii, pp. 406-417. The same author thus describes Jerusalem: "Jérusalem est plus petite que les plus grandes villes, et plus grandes que les villes ordinaires."

⁷ Travels, vol. iv, c. vii, p. 289.

applies to the Christ (Heb. v.) that portion of it which alludes to Melchizidek; and afterwards goes on to inform us, that he (Melchizidek) was without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life,⁸ but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually." But as nothing of all this is to be found in Moses, we cannot help inquiring where St. Paul found his account of the king of Salem. Did he gather it from the words of David? i. e. did he apply the "priest for ever" to Melchizidek, and thus obscure and mystify the simple sense of the passage? or did he, as he would imply (Heb. v. 11), gather his knowledge from the traditions of the Rabbins, and thus give to these traditions all the weight of his authority? I only know that the Melchizidek of St. Paul, save that he is priest and king, has little in common with the Melchizidek of Moses. This one is a mere man, that a supernatural being.

Melchizidek is king and priest: as king he brings forth bread and wine to refresh the wearied followers of Abraham; as priest he appears to give blessings and to receive tithes.

Melchizidek blesses Abraham, and blesses God for having delivered Abraham's enemies into Abraham's hand. Our wars are not always so just as Abraham's; but then with us, as Madame de la Ferté once remarked to Anne of Austria, "*Le bon Dieu se range toujours du côté des gros bataillons.*" And yet, such is the force of habit or of superstition, that we admire the piety of those who before they join battle, like the first William and the Black Prince,⁹ pray to God for victory; and, after they have

⁸ Melchizidek is much more like the great Dalai-Lamâ, than any one else; though I am aware that Bochart, Hyde, Glassius, Lightfoot, &c. have ascertained that he was Shem. I have no telescope that reaches back into those distant ages; but I see nothing in the several accounts of Melchizidek which justifies this supposition.

⁹ "Dès que le Duc Guillaume fut informé de la marche d'Haroldil entendit la messe, et se fortifia le corps et l'âme par les sacrements du Seigneur; puis il suspendit humblement à son cou les saintes reliques sur lesquelles Harold avait juré...Les deux évêques, Odon de Bayeux et Geoffroi de Coutances se trouvaient là avec beau-

gained the victory, return thanks to God for His assistance. In our eyes, the God who listens only to prayers for moral and spiritual excellence, and who answers those prayers even while our heart utters them, is nothing worth. We must have a Deity who shall interpose between us and the accidents of life; who shall preserve us from unforeseen dangers, and heap *on us especially* all sorts of temporal blessings;¹ one of whom it is possible that we become favourites; one who for our sakes may change the great and even course of a just Providence; and who for our sakes, though worlds should perish, may again make the sun to stand still. Hence it is that *we* pray for victory over our enemies, *our* enemies for victory over us; that *some* pray for rain, *others* for sunshine; and that *this nation* asks for deliverance from plague and pestilence, while *that* strives to thwart its prayers.² In our eagerness to realise our wishes, or out of our weakness or our pride, we will not restrain ourselves to the legitimate objects of prayer: we use prayer but as a means for the attainment of that which God every moment tells us must be attained by other exertions. We are yet far from that wise spirit of true religion, which humbly seeks in all things to direct itself according to the law of God.

coup de moines et de clercs, dont l'office était de combattre par les prières et les conseils."—Orderic Vital. trad. de Guizot, vol. ii, liv. iii, p. 140.—When, after vainly endeavouring to accommodate the two parties, the Cardinal de Perigord tells the Black Prince before the battle of Poitiers, "Beau fils, faites ce que vous pourrez, il vous faut combattre, où je ne puis trouver nulle grâce d'accord, ni de paix devers le roi de France," cette dernière parole enfelonni en encouragea grandement le cœur du Prince. Et répondit, 'C'est bien l'intention de nous et des notres, et Dieu vueille aider le droit.'"—Froissart, Chron. c. 354.—So also the Athenians determine to oppose the Persians, trusting to the aid of

the Gods. (Herodotus, viii. 143.)—But the Black Prince, it will be said, prays only that the good cause may prevail. The moment, however, we believe that the Deity interferes to protect right,—that moment duels, battles, trials by ordeal, &c. are legitimate means of asserting the justice of one's demands, or of proving one's innocence.

¹ Bishop Hall indeed says of the Christian, "His prayers are suited according to the degrees of the benefits sued for; *he therefore begs grace absolutely, and temporal blessings with limitation.*"—The Christian, § ix.

² As in the late war, when, on an occasion of a fever desolating France, the British Parliament prohibited the exportation of quinine.

Abraham gave tythes. Of the ancients, the Greeks generally seem to have dedicated a tenth of their spoils to Apollo, though the Athenians dedicated them to Minerva,³ the Samians to Juno,⁴ &c. The Romans gave tythes to Hercules and others of the gods. The Carthaginians sent a tythe of their Sicilian spoils to Hercules at Tyre; and the Arabians offered to Sabis a tenth of their frankincense.⁵ These people gave tythes to the gods for their help,⁶ Abraham to God's priest for his prayers.

Verse 24. "And Abram said, I have lift up my hand unto the Lord." I have sworn, made a vow; the sign of the vow, the hand lifted up, put for the vow itself. We find another form of oath in the second verse of the twenty-fourth chapter. *There*, however, the oath is one which man swears to man, the servant to his master, the son to his father, the subjects to their prince, the inferior to his superior. *Here* the oath is that of an independent prince, who swears by himself or his God; it is the oath of a sovereign, that oath which the Elohim himself swears.⁷

Abraham throughout this little war acts generously and greatly. According to the morality of his age and neighbours, Abraham was justified in retaining that property which he had recovered by his valour.⁸ He saw the booty

³ Herod. lib. iv, § cliii.

⁴ Id. lib. v, § lxxvii.

⁵ Selden, Hist. of Tythes, c. iii; Feithius, in Homer, p. 86; and Animadversiones in Feith. p. 24.

⁶ I see in our national cathedral the *spoila opima* of our enemies, the various colours we have taken from them. Are these trophies evidences of our prowess, or of God's blessings on our arms? If the former, they are no honour to us; if the latter, little better than blasphemy.

⁷ Compare Exodus vi. 8. with Genesis xlvii. 29, and 1 Chronicles xxix. 24. Somewhat similar to this oath of Abraham's was that sworn by the kings in the heroic times: "The oath of them that were sworn

was του σκηπτρου επαναστασις, or "the lifting up of the sceptre," which was called ορκιον σκηπτρον, or "the oath sceptre," and therefore doth Homer make Achilles swear by his sceptre: *Ναι μα το δε σκηπτρον*, and calls it *μεγαν ορκον*, "the great oath."—Selden, Titles of Honour, part i, p. 269. The Caffre chiefs, I have been informed by a friend, swear in the same way, by lifting up their hands.

⁸ The proof is that the king of Sodom makes this offer as though it were customary (see also 1 Sam. xxx. 22), and that Abraham refuses it as though he had foreseen that it would have been made, but at the same time leaves to his allies their portion. That the booty must

rich and tempting ; but he felt that to assist a friend for gain was no friendly assistance ; and he lifted up his hand and swore, that of that booty none should pass into his tents. Abraham has not half the virtue of one of Morton's or Cumberland's heroes. He is *simply great*: like all *great* men, *great* by impulse, *great* unconsciously—but most great when he makes the oath ; for, when he puts forward that oath as a reason for not taking of the goods of Sodom, he acts like any common man of his time, like any unlettered and superstitious barbarian to whom the oath to do, the supposed promise to his God, and not the morality and justice of the deed, are sacred.⁹

But as the oath of Abraham induced him only to a just and good deed, and as we *too frequently* look to some particular result, *too seldom* to the principles and tendencies of a moral act : we shall briefly examine the nature, and use, and abuse, of oaths. An oath is a solemn declaration either truly to perform or to abstain from any act or acts, or truly to speak on any given matter ;—it refers then either to promises or evidence, and presupposes mature deliberation and a fixed purpose. *As referring to evidence*, it prevents the witness from speaking lightly and thoughtlessly, it wakens his conscience, drives him back into himself, and compels him carefully to examine, whether he speaks from *belief* or *knowledge*, and whether his recollection be faint

have been very large, we may gather from Abraham's objection : "Lest thou shouldst say, I have made Abraham rich." I have, however, throughout followed our English version. Luther, Michaelis, and De Wette, all make the oath of Abraham subsequent to the offer of Sodom.

⁹ Le Loyer says of the Guinea negroes : "On peut se reposer sans défiance sur le serment des nègres lorsqu'ils ont juré par leur Fétiches, et surtout lorsqu'ils l'ont avalé. Pour tirer la vérité de leur bouche, il suffit de mêler quelque chose dans l'eau, d'y tremper un morceau

de pain, et de leur faire boire ce Fétiche en témoignage de la vérité. S'ils parlent contre le reproche de leur cœur, rien ne sera capable de les faire toucher la liqueur, parcequ'ils sont persuadés que la mort est infaillible pour ceux qui jurent fausement : mais si ce qu'on leur demande est tel qu'ils disent, ils boiront sans crainte..... Un nègre qui s'engage par cette espèce de lien, trouve plus de crédit parmi ses compatriotes, qu'un Chrétien n'en trouve parmi nous en offrant de jurer sur les saints Evangiles."—Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. iii, p. 438.

and obscure or clear and decided. *As referring to promises*, the oath is ever rash and inconsiderate; but as I wish not to enter into any of those casuistical questions which are as pitfalls and jack-o'-lanthorns in the otherwise plain path of right, I will merely state that the oath is binding only in so far as the promise is binding, *i. e.* possible of execution, legitimate, and not opposed to other and recognised duties.¹

But again an oath is not merely a solemn declaration, but a solemn declaration made to, or before, God, and supposed to be especially sanctioned by divine punishments.² Perjury then, the hidden crime, the crime which the world detects not, is of all crimes the most sure of punishment, and the swearer consequently, as in the case of Jephtha, considers not the lawfulness or justice of the deed he has promised to perform, but solely the oath which is on his soul. And the witness similarly regards his evidence but as an annex to his oath, and as something which, but for his oath, he might change or colour as he

¹ There is so little to praise in Mahommedanism, that I cannot overlook the view it has taken of oaths. In a note referring to a passage at the close of the seventeenth chapter of the Koran, Sale informs us, "that the infidels having abused the dead body of Hamza, Mohammed's uncle, by taking out his bowels, &c.; when Mohammed saw it, he swore that if God granted him success, he would retaliate those cruelties on seventy of the Koreish; but he was by these words forbidden to execute what he had sworn, and accordingly made void his oath."—Sale's Koran, vol. ii, p. 91.

² Thus Agamemnon, when the truce has been broken by Pandarus, comforts Menelaus with the assurance that the blood of lambs and the libations of wine have not been poured out in vain, that the broken

treaties Jove himself will punish (Il. iv. 158), and afterwards (verse 237) he tells the Greeks that they who break treaties will be themselves torn with vultures (compare Jerem. xxxiv. 20), and their wives and children made slaves: "Quamobrem veteres Græci perjurium Deo soli puniendum reliquerunt, ut docet Demosthenes in Aristocratem. Unde etiam apud Cic. de Leg. (lib. ii, c. ix.), Perjurii pœna divina exitium; humana dedecus."—Feith. Antiq. Homer, p. 542. See also Diodorus' account of the Temple of the Palices, lib. xi.—Menu similarly expressly declares that "He whom the blazing fire burns not, whom the water soon forces not up, or who meets with no speedy misfortune, must be held veracious in his testimony on oath." (Chap. viii, p. 115), *i. e.* that he whom God does not punish is not perjured.

pleased: he respects oaths but despises truths: he will lie, but he will not swallow his fetisch.³

Of the oath, the oath based on superstition, the state, ever indolent, has of course ever freely availed itself, so freely indeed that we might almost think it had created its deities only to serve its own purposes. The oath is a state engine, a guard for that easy chair in which the state so peacefully slumbers, and a steel trap or spring gun to catch or kill the consciences of the people. Oaths it scatters about as though they were blessings. It applies *the promissory oath*, to oblige man to that which is not in man's power, to answer, *not* for one particular act, but for the opinions and conduct of his future life; and the *evidence oath*, forgetting that what is solemn must be rare and must be solemnly approached, it thrusts upon us on every occasion: it seems to lead its subjects on to their own damnation: it damns so many, and these many so often prosper, that the oath loses its terrors; but, thank God, as the oath loses its terrors, truth grows more lovely.

Eichhorn⁴ asserts that this chapter appears like a fragment in the history of Abraham. With the fifteenth chapter it has no connexion whatever, and with the twelfth and thirteenth none, save that it narrates an event which happened after the separation of Abraham and Lot. Its style and manner moreover strikingly distinguish it from all other parts of Genesis. Here and here only does the Deity bear the name of EL ELJON KONE SCHAMAIM VAAREZ; here and here only is the Creator KONE Schamaim Vaarez; here and here only is Abraham, the Hebrew, and here too and here only do we find so many parentheses explanatory of geographical names (ver. 2, 3, 7, 8, 17). Lastly the expressions it puts into the mouths of its personages so strictly in keeping with their different

³ Vide note ⁹, p. 309, supra, and with this compare the pious fraud by which Robert of France sought to escape the penalty of the oath,

and to save others from it.—Michelet, Hist. de France, vol. ii, p. 141.

⁴ Einleitung in das alte Testament, § 407.

characters betray a cotemporary author. Thus the king of Salem, a foreigner, does not like a Hebrew speak of a JEHOVAH or EL SCHADAI, or ELOHIM, but of an EL ELJON; and not of a BORE, but of a KONE Schamaim Vaarez. And on the other hand, Abraham the Hebrew when he swears, lifts up his hand to JEHOVAH, whom his friend acknowledged as EL ELJON KONE SCHAMAIM VAA-REZ. This strict attention to costume, together with the frequent explanations which the transcriber of this particular narrative found it necessary to add to the geographical names, induces Eichhorn to regard this chapter as the production of some one who if he were not a witness of, at least lived in or near the period of the events which he records.

This chapter, by whomsoever written, is an extraordinary one. It abounds in the names of kings and nations; it is this chapter which first gives an account of national wars, and which first speaks of alliances offensive and defensive between different nations: it is the chapter which first alludes to slavery and the office of priests, and the payment of tythes, and the sanctity of oaths⁵—and the only chapter in this book which is exclusively occupied with wars and their results.

With this expedition of Abraham, and his refusal of the spoil, we may compare the expedition of David against the Amalekites, &c. narrated in 1 Sam. xxx.

With the tythes paid by Abraham to Melchizidik we may connect the various laws respecting tythes in Lev. xxvii; Numb. xviii, &c.

⁵ It would seem from a passage in the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, v. 645, 652 (see Hermann ad h. l.) that it was in Greece a crime to doubt or disbelieve the oath taker (see *supra*, note ⁹ p. 309.) Did the same feeling prevail in Israel? Again in Greece, where the oath was so sacred a thing, how small a matter

was a lie we may learn from the opening of the *Philoctetes*, 109, 10, and comp. 1325. Similarly in Israel, witness the falsehoods of Abraham and the oath of Jephtha, and contrast the treachery of David to Achish with the tenacity of his faith and of his vengeance towards Shimei.

CHAPTER XIII.

GENESIS xv. 1-21.

Verse 1. "After these things," those events mentioned in the last chapter, and in reference to them,¹—is it not? notwithstanding Eichhorn's assertion, that the Lord comes to Abraham saying "Fear not, &c."

Verse 2. Jacob made terms with God as he made them with his brother; and his descendants, following his example, clung ever to the temporal promises and the creature blessings, which were to be the reward of the faithful. But Abram, though he occasionally showed himself weak and temporising, loved God, I always thought, with a simple and honest love: his was a religion of conviction and not of interest. I was glad that, even in the midst of the grossest heathen ignorance, the great God was worshipped and contemplated in his purity and excellence. Nevertheless when I began to reflect on this "What wilt thou give me?" my heart sank within me: I felt as though Abraham's faith and service also were but commercial spe-

¹ In reference to the preceding chapter, Michaelis has translated "I will be thy shield:" "Ich will freygebig seyn gegen dich:" "I will be bountiful towards thee." Luther instead of "after these things," has "Nach diesen Geschichten:" "after this event." Eichhorn might indeed still insist that the compiler was of course obliged to knit together the

several traditions he made use of by the bond of time at least; but that between this chapter and the fifteenth there was in reality no connexion. It seems to me, however, that this chapter would be almost unintelligible without the one that precedes it: that one accounts for the subsequent promise ratified by a covenant.

culations. Now however,—taking to my aid the rationalist method of interpretation, and using it not to interpret this verse as it was interpreted by them for whom it was written, but merely to explain this chapter, so that it may harmonise with whatever else we know of the character of Abraham,—I view the matter in another light.

Abraham believing in one God had quitted his father's house, fallen into idolatry. Separated from his friend and brother, he was, though rich in cattle and in servants and in silver and in gold, alone in the world. He had no son to whom to teach his doctrine, it must perish with him. And yet in the days of his manhood, he had talked with God: he had rejoiced in visions of magnificent promise: he had been inspired with the hope that in him all families of the earth should be blessed. Now then that he has restored his brother to liberty, and saved the daughters and wives of his allies from pollution and their sons from slavery: now that he has made a nation happy, and refused the gifts their gratitude would have heaped upon him: and now that in the solitude of his tent he walks meditating, the consciousness of having acted well and justly cheers him; his heart is light; the still small voice, and it is to him as the voice of God, whispers, "Fear not Abraham, I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward." And what more could he desire?—Soon however other and gloomy thoughts gather round him.—He has wealth and power, and he bears an honoured name, but what avails it? He stands already "on the silent solemn shore of death's vast ocean," and one born in his house is his heir—the nothingness of all things temporal overwhelms him. And now he goes forth into the open heaven, and the stars and their beauty fill his soul, and his God is their Creator, and before Him he bows himself, and gradually the hopes and assurances of other days warm his heart, and he rises with the grateful consciousness that God will realise the wishes of His servant; and God counted it to him for righteousness.

But Abraham remembers that with the promise of posterity is associated the possession of the land of Canaan—and the internal voice bids him therefore ask of the Lord

a sign whereby he shall know "that he shall inherit it." And he takes unto him a heifer and a she goat, and lays them one upon the other and watches them; but as evening comes on, a deep sleep falls upon him, and the horror of great darkness, and the prophetic vision again passes before him, and the fate of his posterity is then clearly made known. And when he wakes, lo! the sacrifice he had prepared was consumed.

But in order to magnify Abraham, it is not for us to slur over the written word, whose every letter is of such deep import, and whose every syllable so rules the moral fate of thousands. We cannot alter its sentences at will, nor accommodate them to our opinions. We must look diligently for its legitimate meaning, which, however obscured by the fictions of commentaries, will still show forth in many a practical consequence; we shall thus judge the book by its own intrinsic worth, and learn to hold it at its proper value. We will therefore examine this chapter in detail.

"Fear not Abram, I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward." For me, there breathes more of the spirit of true religion in these few and simple words, than in all Moses' solemn hymn of Creation, or Job's magnificent exaltations of the Elohim's power. The *religious* and the *irreligious* man are subject to the same hazards; in the great lottery of life they play with the same chances; and as the world's great prizes are equally within the reach of both, so neither is exempt from the ills and disappointments, the pains and penalties of mortality. Both, then, equally enjoy success; but in sickness, under misfortune, *the one* is oppressed by the failure of his hopes and the loss of his happiness, while *the other* clings the more earnestly to his God whom he finds to be indeed his reward. Yes; God is thy reward—and *now*; riches are trodden under foot, unnoticed and unseen; earthly glory stalks away an unsubstantial vision; health itself becomes a common field-flower, and the very heart's happiest affec-

tions pale before the brightness of the beatific reality. God is thy reward; and the worn monk treads his cloisters with a still thoughtful but a happier step. God is thy reward; and his denuded cell wears now to the hermit's eye a beauty before which the gorgeousness of palaces is but a tinselled poverty. God is thy reward; and the needy curate travels from cottage to cottage and pours comfort and blessings into many a wounded heart, and forgets the scanty meal, the hard-working wife, the sickly children, and the cheerless home which await him. He is happier than a mitred prelate. God is thy reward; and the simple peasant who heartily and honestly performs his simple duties, cramped and narrowed though they be by his ignorance and his prejudices, even he is conscious of a joy which he knows well that the earth cannot give. God is thy reward; and that poor student,² who rejected wealth and honour as incompatible with the great objects which he had set up for himself, who literally gave up all for truth and found error, who built up a system which had room only for an overwhelming necessity, who lived unfriended and unloved, whose whole life was one martyrdom,—was not God his reward? Oh! assuredly; for He ever has been, and ever will be the reward even of those who know Him not or who reject Him; of the deluded but honest heathen, or, if such an one exist, of the deluded but honest Atheist.³

“I am thy exceeding great reward.” These words contain the whole mystery and beauty of religion. Yet it may be doubted whether they faithfully render the Hebrew; Michaelis, and a greater authority than he, De Wette, have given the passage another sense. The first translates the words thus: “Ich will freygebig gegen dich seyn, und deinen Lohn sehr gross machen,”—“I will be bountiful towards thee, and make *thy reward* very great,” De Wette: “Ich bin dein Schild; grossen Lohn sollst du

² I have before me the life and character of Spinoza.

³ The existence of the Atheist I doubt; not his honesty, if he do exist.

haben!" *i. e.* "I am thy shield; great shall be thy reward!" Both these translations are, it must be owned, more in harmony with Abraham's answer than our's. They may therefore be correct and literal: but what then? is it less true that God is the reward of all who with heart and soul serve Him? Not, though every verse of this book were to deny it.

"What wilt thou give me?" Uncivilized, or half-civilized man is in his religion a selfish utilitarian of the lowest order. His gods are there to satisfy his wants,⁴ to realize his hopes, or to quiet his fears, or to avert misfortune. Is he in sickness? a god will give him⁵ health. Is he a-hungered? a god will procure him⁶ food. Is he in danger? a god will be his⁷ protector. With such views,

⁴ "Si les Kamschatdales ne donnent rien à leur dieux, c'est qu'ils en attendent peu de choses. Ces peuples ne peuvent croire qu'un Dieu puisse leur faire du bien."—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. xix, p. 299. "Les Indiens ont pour principe invariable qu'il faut honorer tout être, animé ou non, qui a le pouvoir de nous faire du mal. 'Mon Dieu!' me dit un Indien de quelque considération, 'c'est le chef des hommes qui cultivent mes terres; comme ils travaillent sous ses ordres, il peut en usant de son ascendant me faire beaucoup de bien ou de mal.'"—*Dubois, Indes*, vol. ii, p. 297. Vide also *Diod. Sic.* account of the Troglodyti, who give their cattle names of endearment which they refuse to their parents.—*Lib. iii, § xvii.*

⁵ So in Egypt Isis was the universal healer; she gave sight to the blind and new limbs to the maimed. (*Diod. Sic. lib. i, §.xiv.*) So Naaman the Syrian applies to Elisha the prophet (2 Kings v.), and so of the Gold Coast negroes we are told: "Leurs docteurs en médecine sont en même tems leurs prêtres, et ces imposteurs n'ont pas de peine à

persuader aux malades que pour se rétablir ils doivent offrir quelque présent aux Fétiches."—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. iv, p. 145. In a more advanced state, to the assistance of the gods called down by a charm men add medicines; thus (*Odyssey xix, 457*) Ulysses binds the wound with all art, and "with a charme staide stright the blood."

⁶ "Chaque jour les nègres de Guinée, levant les yeux aux ciel, font cette prière: 'Mon Dieu, donnez-moi aujourd'hui du riz et des ignames; donnez-moi de l'or et de l'aigris; donnez-moi des esclaves et des richesses; donnez-moi la santé, et accordez-moi d'être prompt et actif.'"—*Hist. Générale des Voyages*, vol. iii, p. 436.

⁷ Of the Samojeedes it is reported that they neglect and are indifferent to all the customary ceremonies of religion: "Le ministère de leurs prêtres se borne à leur donner des avis et des idoles de leur façon, lorsqu'il arrive qu'ils sont plus malheureux que de contume dans leur chasses, ou qu'il leur parvient quelque maladie."—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. xviii, p. 509.

he can never inquire, *who is the God* he prays to; only, *what God* will most probably answer his prayers. Hence it is, that “unknown gods”⁸ are worshipped, and that Typhon and Moloch⁹ have their altars; that the very furies are honoured; that blights and mildews receive oblation;¹ and that even vices are raised to deities.² Hence, too, it is that several races of men, while they acknowledge, neglect, the one great and good God;—*some*³ because *He* is, they argue, so good, that of His own accord and unasked He will do them all the good in His power; *others* because they suppose that He has altogether retired from the government of the world, and given it over to a number of subordinate beings, who appear as gods, angels, genii;⁴—the *former* consequently worship in the hope that they may conciliate the evil spirits who make it their business to thwart the plans of the Deity, and to injure and torment mankind; while *the latter*, like true courtiers, pay all due reverence and tribute to God’s lieutenants, the flexible dispensers, as they believe, of all earthly good and evil.

⁸ Acts, xvii.

⁹ *τυφωναία*. — Creuzer, Symbolik, B. ii, § viii. For “Moloch,” vide art. *Carthago*, by Gesenius, Ersch und Gruber’s Encyclop.

¹ Varro, De Re Rust. lib. i, when he invokes the rustic deities’ names, “Quarto Robigum et Floram, quibus propitiis, neque rubigo frumenta atque arbores corrumpit neque non tempestive florent. Itaque publicæ robigo feriæ robigolia; floræ ludi floralia instituti.”

² Among the Mexicans: “Les vices avoient leurs divinités comme les vertus; le courage et la poltronnerie, l’avarice et la libéralité, étoient honorés sous des bizarres figures.”—From Herrera; Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 597, ed. Holl. So also the Romans and Greeks. Vide Cudworth. Int. Sys. lib. i, § iv.

³ “L’idée que ces idolâtres (Tartares de Sibérie) ont de Dieu c’est qu’il ne sauroit faire que du bien, et qu’il ne fait jamais du mal à

aucune créature. Par cette raison même ils le négligent; ils croient que l’être bon par essence doit nécessairement faire du bien, sans qu’on soit obligé de le lui demander, ni qu’on lui en ait grande obligation. Ainsi toute leur dévotion se tourne vers l’être malfaisant.”—Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 393, ed. Par. So also the Samojedes, Id. p. 508; so also the North American Indians, Sitten d. Wilden, vol. iii, p. 80, 81.

⁴ “Les nègres d’Issini reconnoissent un Dieu Créateur de toutes choses, et particulièrement des Fétiches, qu’il envoie sur la terre pour rendre service au genre humain. Ils ont appris par une ancienne tradition qu’ils sont redevables aux Fétiches de tous les biens de la vie, et que ces êtres ont aussi le pouvoir de leur causer toutes sortes de maux. Dieu a donné tout son pouvoir aux Fétiches, et ne s’en est pas réservé.” Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. iii, p. 436.

This self-seeking spirit, in whatever creed it may be found, to whatever deity it may address itself, is the very root and heart of all heathenism. I cannot distinguish between the devotion of Samovatsa⁵ and of Cræsus,⁶ who, for the same object, the enlargement of their empire, both sought—though in different ways and certainly with different results—to gain the favour of their respective gods. I must avow also, that the prayer of Hezekiah⁷ when told that he must die, to my mind evidences the same views of God and of religion as the reproach of the Egyptian Mycerinus,⁸ on being informed that the close of his life was at hand. I cannot reverence the piety of David, who, having treacherously procured the death of his servant, fasts, and in sackcloth and ashes beseeches the Lord that the punishment of his crime may be averted;⁹ and then ridicule the superstition, or shudder at the blasphemy of him,¹ who,

⁵ “*Samovatsa* was a warlike and ambitious but a wise and devout prince, and he performed austere acts of humiliation to Vishnu, *with a desire of enlarging his empire*, and the gods granted his boon.”—Wilford on the Nile, Asiatic Researches, vol. iii, p. 437.

⁶ See, the magnificent presents of Cræsus to Delphi (Herod. lib. i, § 51, 52), and after his defeat by Cyrus the account of the embassy which he sent with his fetters to the same temple, inquiring whether it was the custom of the Grecian gods to be ungrateful.—Id. ib. § 90.

⁷ 2 Kings xx. 30.

⁸ Mycerinus was in Egypt what Hezekiah was in Judea—a great *religious restorer*. A message is however sent him from Butos, that he has but twelve years to live, on which he reproachfully reminds the god of his religious services, &c.—Herod. lib. ii, § cxxxiii.

⁹ 2 Sam. xii. 14; and compare with it verse 16.

¹ Louis XI. The story is thus related by Brantome: “Entre plu-

sieurs bon tours et dissimulations, feintes finesses et galanteries, que fit ce bon roy en son tems, fut celuy, lorsque par gentille industrie il fit mourir son frère, le Duc de Guyenne, quand il y pensoit le moins, et luy faisoit le plus beau semblant de l’aimer, luy vivant, et le regrettant après sa morte; si bien que personne s’en aperçut qu’il eut fait faire le coup sinon par le moyen de son fol..... Estant donc un jour en ses bonnes prières et oraisons à Clery, devant Notre Dame qu’il appeloit sa bonne patrone, au grand autel, et n’ayant personne auprès de luy, sinon ce fol, qui en estoit un peu éloigné...il l’entendit comme il disoit: ‘Ah! ma bonne Dame, ma petite maîtresse, ma grande amie, en qui j’ay toujours eu mon reconfort! je te prie de supplier Dieu qu’il me pardonne la mort de mon frère, que j’ai fait empoisonner par ce méchant abbé de St. Jean. Je m’en confesse à toi comme à ma bonne patrone et maîtresse; mais aussi qu’eussé-je su faire? Il ne me faisoit que troubler mon

having poisoned his brother, was heard to ask, of "his Lady of Clery, his best friend, his comfort, his patroness, that she should procure his pardon, and overlook his crime." In my eyes, the deluded Chinese who, to obtain the blessings of Fo, purchased a nail from the Bonze's chair,² showed as pure a faith as that neophyte, who to make God his debtor brought in a time of scarcity his little all as a contribution to the Church, in the certain hope that it would be returned to him a hundredfold.³ I feel that it is not the name we give our God, but the heart with which we approach Him; and not the rites or ceremonies, but the motives, of worship, which constitute the character of our religion. The heathen man may rejoice in a Christian, as the Christian man may be cursed with a Heathen, spirit.

What shall we say then? that it is a crime to pray for temporal blessings? that we must look on the objects of our dearest affections, as they struggle against pain or death, and never once raise up our hands or our voice to

royaume; fays-moi donc pardonner, ma bonne Dame, et je say ce que je te donneray."—Digression sur Louis XI.

² "Je rencontrai un jour, dit le P. le Comte, au milieu d'un village un jeune Bonze débonnaire, doux, et tout propre à demander l'aumône et à l'obtenir. Il étoit debout dans une chaise bien fermée et hérissée en dedans de longues pointes de cloux...de manière qu'il ne lui étoit pas permis de s'appuyer sans se blesser; deux hommes gagez le portoient fort lentement dans les maisons, où il prioit les gens d'avoir compassion de lui. 'Je me suis,' disoit-il, 'enfermé dans cette chaise, pour le bien de vos âmes, résolu de n'en sortir jamais jusqu'à ce que l'on ait acheté tous ces cloux (il y en avoit plus de deux mille), chaque clou vaut dix sols; mais il n'y en a aucun qui ne soit une source de bénédictions dans vos maisons. Si vous achetez, vous pratiquerez un acte de vertu héroïque, et ce sera

un aumône que vous donnerez, non aux Bonzes, à qui vous pouvez d'ailleurs faire vos charités, mais au Dieu Fo, à l'honneur duquel nous bâtissons un temple;" &c.—Du Halde, Chine, vol. iii, p. 28.

³ "Dans un tems où l'on étoit menacé d'une famine générale, un bon néophyte.....mit aux pieds du père Bouchet cinq fanons; le père refusa d'abord son offrande, apportant pour raison que durant la cherté il étoit difficile qu'il ne fût dans le besoin. 'Il est vrai, mon père,' répondit ce fervent néophyte, 'que ces cinq fanons font toutes mes richesses, et que la disette qui augmente tous les jours me réduit à la dernière extrémité; mais c'est pour cela même que je fais présent à l'église du peu que je possède; Dieu devient mon débiteur; ne me payera-t-il pas au centuple?'"—Lettres Edifiantes, xi. p. 89. This is also pure Mahommedanism. A frequent exhortation of the Koran is, "Lend to God on good usury."

God, that he may pity us and save them? *Morally*, that is no crime which is not the result of criminal intention. The question then is, *not* whether such prayers are a crime, nay, not even whether such prayers are consistent with our ideas of the Deity, *but* whether such prayers are ever answered,—and who shall assert that they are not? The temples of Greece and Rome were graced with many a votive tablet which gratitude had laid at the feet of the preserving God. And in *Catholic countries* we have but to approach the shrine of any favourite saint, to see there pictures and figures commemorating diseases which the saint has cured, or dangers from which he has preserved his votary. And among *Protestants* I have met men of deep religious feelings and of no vulgar intellect, who cite their own experience of the efficacy of prayer in temporal matters. We must therefore observe,

i. That those events which are attributed to divine interposition, the consequence of prayer, might possibly, the most bigoted must allow, have happened under any circumstances whatever,—might in fact have taken place, had no prayer ever been offered.

ii. That prayers for divine interposition and assistance, however earnestly made, and with however firm a faith, are not in general granted,—in other words, the hazards and accidents of life may very fairly account for the grant of these prayers, whenever they are granted.

iii. That cases of divine interposition are always more striking and more numerous, as the nation is more superstitious and ignorant.⁴

iv. That such cases may be found in every creed;⁵ and

⁴ It was but lately that I took up Stilling's "Lehrjahren" and found it filled with examples of God's especial providence shown in worldly matters; *e.g.* do Stilling's creditors press him for money, he prays earnestly and money is found. His life, in so far as these matters are concerned, is a pendent to Huntington's, the S.S. or Sinner Saved.

He was a man, however, of a higher order, of an honest, simple, and not uncultivated mind.

⁵ Vide Jeremiah xlv. 17, 18. "All the people answered Jeremiah saying.....We will not hearken unto thee.....but will burn incense unto the queen of Heaven, and pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done....for then had we plenty

are ever quoted by the priests and votaries of any creed in evidence of the truth and efficacy of their belief.⁶

The evil effects of this belief in the efficacy of prayer in temporal matters are,

1. That it induces too high an estimation of temporal blessings; and, so long as men possess these blessings, a moral and religious slothfulness. Hence it is that we find *rich and powerful nations* negligent of the rites and services of their creed, though contented with and unwilling to change their form of religion: *poor and unhappy*, on the other hand, diligent in worship, but ever ready to swear fealty to any new God.⁸

of victuals and were well and saw no evil; but since we left off to burn incense to the queen of Heaven and to pour out drink offerings to her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by famine," &c. The queen of Heaven gave because she was pleased, gratified with the adoration she received; and she withheld her gifts because that adoration ceased.

⁶ Of these reasons I must avow that only the two first weigh with me; the two last I add because they only will probably weigh with others. For if it be in the great scheme of Providence that prayer should be effectual, I believe it will be effectual in one creed as well as another.

⁷ Vide p. 128, supra. See also what Pallas relates of some Tartar tribes: "*Weil sie meist alle reich an Vieh sind so haben sie sich noch immer wieder zum Ackerbau, noch zum Christenthum entschliessen wollen.*"—*Reise durch d. Russis. Reich.* vol. iii, p. 400. The same reason is also given for the Boltiren remaining heathens (*Ib.* p. 355); see also note supra from Jeremiah, and Volney's account of the indifference of the Arabs in matters of religion, *Travels in Syria*, c. xxiii.

⁸ P. 128, supra; and see 2 Chron. xxv, 28—the reason why Ahaz

sacrifices to the gods of Damascus; also the account of the Ostiac penates in *Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. xviii, p. 521: "Lorsque ces idoles ne paroissent pas prendre assez d'intérêt à leurs petites fortunes, ils les dépouillent, les maltraitent, et quelque fois même les jettent au feu.....et fabriquent d'autres. Mais lorsqu'ils prospèrent, lorsqu'ils croient avoir à se louer de la protection de leurs dieux, il n'y a point d'honneurs dont ils ne les comblent. Ils les caressent tendrement, ils les couvrent des fourures les plus précieuses, ils les placent à l'endroit le plus honorable de leur cabane, ils leur offrent en sacrifice des animaux, des poissons, et les barbouillent de leur graisse." So (Brydone?) relates of some Sicilian mariners in a storm, that after having vainly besought their saint to allay the violence of the wind, they finished by ill-treating and throwing his image into the sea. So also the Neapolitans, if the blood of San Januarius refuses to flow, after they are wearied of prayers, try the efficacy of abuse and curses; and in Brittany, according to Michelet: "*Le saint qui n'exauce pas les prières risque d'être vigoureusement fouetté.*"—*Histoire de France*, vol. ii, p. 19.

II. That it diverts the mind from the legitimate objects of prayer. The world is, even in the world, too much with us: let us if possible shut it out from our closets. *There* at least let us examine ourselves and forget our fortunes; *there* let us meditate on the divine perfections and the great and just laws of Providence; and *there* let us study diligently our moral life and measure it by the highest excellence; and *then* each one of our deficiencies will be, not merely acknowledged, but painfully felt; against them we will struggle and most earnestly pray; and soon sin and crime are odious and abominable in our eyes. With a high and pure ideal too ever before us, great thoughts become familiar to us,—they are the forerunners of great deeds,—our nature gradually rises almost to the very height of our aspirations—our lives are the realisation of our prayers.

Verse 3. “And lo, one born in my house is my heir!” Lot was alive, and had sons and daughters. Lot was loved of Abraham,—the expedition against Chedorlaomer proves it; and yet Abraham, who so clung to his family and the purity of his race, that he chose out of it a wife for his son, is now so neglectful of his name and blood, that he speaks of one of his slaves as his heir. Had Lot, the inhabitant of Sodom, fallen away from the true faith? Is he now an idolater,⁹ that Abraham prefers to him a stranger and a slave?

Abraham had numerous slaves. They seem to have belonged to him:

1st. By right of inheritance: they were a portion of his paternal property.

2ndly. By accident of birth: they were born in his house—of his slaves.

3rdly. By right of purchase: they were bought with his money.

4thly. By right of gift: they were given to him, by

⁹ From chap. xix. 29. It would seem as if Lot had been saved from Sodom, more especially for Abraham's sake.

Pharaoh for example, as presents: in this way probably Hagar came into the service of Sarah.

These several modes of acquisition are evidence that slave property was a valuable and legal property, and that slavery was already sanctioned by long established usage. How did it originate?

The first right which the barbarian acknowledges, is the right of strength: "to the measure of his might" he fashions his laws. The new-born child lies at his, a father's feet, naked and helpless;—the child's doom is in his hands;—if he raise the infant, give him food, and clothe and house him,¹ in return the growing child does him suit and service; *at first*, because he fears the father's strength; *afterwards*, because he respects his experience; *and at last*, because obedience has become a habit. Should however the father, pressed by his necessities or dissuaded by his indolence, reject the child: then, if he do not immediately put the infant to death,² he will either expose him in some public or unfrequented place, or else he will sell him. The child thus falls into the hands of a stranger, and that stranger immediately takes the father's place and becomes entitled to the father's rights:³ the child must do his will,—serve him, labour for him: he has nothing of his own, he can acquire nothing, his time and hands are his master's. And when therefore he grows up, and himself becomes a father, because he has nothing, it is not in his power to pronounce on the life of his own offspring, his master alone can do that:—his offspring are thus, even from their birth, like himself, slaves. We have now a slave population.

¹ Vide Michelet, *Symbolique*, p. 2 and 7.

² A relic of this custom was the Spartan law, which transferred the power from the father to the state. Michelet *ib.*

³ *The extent of these rights* we may gather, from the story of Abraham, who drives Ishmael into the desert—and prepares to sacrifice

Isaac—their *inalienability*, from 2 Kings iv, 1, by which it seems that the sons' bodies were liable for the father's debts—even after his death. And it was the recognition of these national rights which I doubt not induced the Egyptians to mitigate the punishment for infanticide. (Vid. Diodorus Sic. lib. i, c. xxvii.)

Again, if the father have a right to sell his children, the man also has a right to sell himself; and famine,⁴ the curse of all uncivilised societies, or some pressing want often drives the unfortunate or the poor to give themselves as slaves, for the purpose of obtaining food or money. This slavery was: sometimes for a specified time, and then approached to our condition of servant;—thus Jacob served Laban seven years for the sake of his daughter. Sometimes for life;—thus in a famine the Egyptians sold themselves to their king;⁵—and thus the Germans, after having lost all, would stake themselves and their liberty on the dice.

Again: the state, for certain crimes or on certain occasions, condemned its subjects⁷ to slavery, either public or private.—thus Anysis when he was king of Egypt, in the place of putting criminals to death, employed them in raising the embankments of the several cities to which they belonged.⁸ Thus too among the Hebrews the thief⁹ became the slave of him whom he had robbed; and the debtor¹ and even his children, of him of whom he had borrowed.

Again with wars, as a natural consequence came slavery.

⁴ “ Dans les troubles et malheurs de la troisième dynastie, les pauvres, qui se voyoient sans ressource, se donnoient, avec leurs familles, aux grands et aux riches qui vouloient les nourrir. *Mém. des Chinois*, vol. ii. p. 411; and see “Toy Cart,” Wilson’s *Hindu Theatre*, vol. i, p. 48; Mungo Park’s *Travels in Africa*, p. 248.

⁵ Genesis xlvii. 23, “Behold I have bought you this day.”

⁶ Tacitus, *Germania*, s. 24.

⁷ According to the Chinese books, “Il n’y avoit point d’esclaves, ni hommes, ni femmes, dans l’antiquité. (Herodotus similarly of the Athenians in the early times, *Ὅτι γὰρ εἶναι τούτων τὸν χρόνον σφίσι, οὐδὲ τοῖσι ἀλλοῖσι Ἑλλήσι οὐκετάς*, lib. vi, § 137) Les premiers qui furent esclaves furent des coupables qui perdirent leur liberté par les tra-

voux et le prison auxquels ils furent condamnés en punition de leurs crimes.” *Mém. Chin.* vol. ii, 430.

⁸ Herod. lib. ii. § 137. Diodorus (lib. i, § lxi,) attributes this to Sabacon, of whom let me add that he is the only king on record who gave up voluntarily the sovereign power rather than retain it at the price of blood.

⁹ Exod. xxii, 3.

¹ Nehemiah chap. v. So also in Rome—and in Athens to the time of Solon, “Bis auf Solon konnte jeder seine Kinder verkaufen und sich selbst seinem Gläubigen persönlich so verpflichten dass er wenn er nicht zahlte in Sklaverei verfeil, sowohl in das Ausland verkauft zu werden als in eigenem Lande Sklav zu seyn.”—Tittman *Griech. Staatsverf.* p. 12.

A kindly feeling,² and some perception of future advantages, induced the conquerors to turn to use the bodily strength and acquirements of their captives instead of putting them to death. Thus the Gibeonites became servants, hewers of wood and drawers of water, in the house of God for ever. And thus among the negroes³ one of the principal objects of war is the obtaining of slaves and booty. They fight, as did the four kings, for captives and plunder.

Lastly; another great source of slavery was piracy and robbery. From the poems of Homer and from Herodotus we learn that the Phœnicians⁴ and other sea-faring nations, were infamous in this way. They carried off when opportunity offered women and children whom they sold among the neighbouring people.

Verse 6. If by disobedience, the consequence of disbelief, man lost Eden; and if, having lost Eden, the imagination of his heart be evil from his youth—how now that he is chained down to a hopeless degradation, shall he recover his former grace, and gain again the favour of the Deity? The historian solves the difficulty. To the aged Abraham “this life-dead man in an old dungeon flong” Jehovah promises a son, “that shall come forth out of his

² A feeling which the Israelites did not always indulge in—witness their extirpation of the Midianites (Numb. xxxi); and one in which even civilized Greece was not always consistent—witness the massacres of the inhabitants of Mitylene and of the youth of Melos by the Athenians; and the massacre of the Athenian chiefs by the Sicilians. (Diod. Sic. lib. xiii.) In general, however, the Greeks made slaves of their prisoners. To this point of humanity the North American Indians have not yet reached. Except, on very rare occasions (as when the mother or the wife of one of their own slain will take a captive in the

place of the son or husband) they put *all* their captives to death.—Vide Lafitau, *Mœurs des Sauvages*, vol. ii, p. 268, 308.

³ The mode in which slaves are made among the negroes of Guinea are the following: “Ou ils ont été vendus par leurs parens, *ou pris à la guerre*, ou condamnés pour leurs crimes, ou réduit à ce triste sort par la pauvreté.”—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. iv, p. 175.

⁴ See: the opening of the History of Herodotus, the account of the carrying away of Io, Europa, Medea: Eumæus tale (Odys. xv); and the character of the Achæans in Schlosser Alt. Gesch. vol. i, p. 311.

own bowels." Abraham believed in this promise, and it is counted to him for righteousness. As disbelief was the one sin for which man was banished to this dark world of shadows—so belief, belief in Jehovah, is the one great virtue, the Sybil's golden branch, which turns away the flaming swords of the cherubim and once more opens to us the gates of Paradise.

In our eyes, this particular act of belief, which gained for Abraham so high a prize, cannot but seem something most natural. We wonder *not* so much at Abraham's faith as at his want of it. We ask how he who talked with God, should so far doubt God's word as to ask a sign of him. *For us* one promise had sufficed: on that we would have staked our lives. There is a taint of Pistol or Parolles in all of us. Is it not clear either that Abraham had conceptions of the Deity very different from our own, or that these promises were not made directly and personally by Jehovah Himself—though the text often so gives us to understand—but were delivered either in dreams or visions as in the present case, or by oracles, which might be, *the first*, delusive and therefore require confirmation; *the last*, of doubtful meaning, and therefore require interpretation.

Verses 7-17. Jehovah orders Abraham to prepare a sacrifice, and He then makes a covenant with Abraham, observing all the usual forms⁵—the animals are divided; and a smoking furnace and a burning lamp (fire is one of the forms in which the Deity loves to appear) pass between the pieces. Jehovah thus binds Himself by the most solemn of oaths to fulfil His promise.

Jehovah however at the same time declares the conditions under which Abraham's posterity shall possess the

⁵ See Jerem. xxxiv. 18, 19, 20: "And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant.....when they cut the calf in twain and passed between the parts thereof...

I will even give them into the hands of their enemies and into the hands of men that seek their life, and their dead bodies shall be meat unto the fowls of the heaven."

land—four hundred years, or four generations, must pass away, and pass away in servitude—of which perhaps the fowls that came down on the carcasses were an omen—ere the iniquity of the Amorites is full, and the land shall be given up to the Abrahamites.

Verse 18. The Elohim has already established his covenant with Noah on the behalf of mankind, Jehovah now enters into a covenant with Abraham on the behalf of Abraham's descendants. These two covenants resemble each other in that they are covenants on the part of the Deity to fulfil certain promises, and to fulfil them unconditionally. Man is no party to them, except in so far as they are made in his favour, to allay his doubts, and to pacify his fears. From these covenants, and others which we afterwards meet with, and which as we proceed onward become more solemn, for in them man and God are parties, the collection of the Hebrew Sacred Scriptures derives its name. It is not inaptly called, the Book of the Old Covenant.

To this Book of the Covenant, as regards its form and contents, the Parsi scripture, the Zendavesta⁶ or Book of the Living Word, bears some resemblance. Both—the one in the Pentateuch, the other in the Vendidad⁷ or Law given of God,—contain the national code of their respective countries. Both too profess to make known the character and attributes of the Deity as manifested in the government of the world, and to reveal that course of action moral and religious which shall ensure to man as well the divine favour as all earthly happiness. In both moreover the revelations of the Deity are delivered, not at one moment, but from time to time; either as the Deity of his own accord⁸ may think fit to communicate them: or as they

⁶ “ ‘Zendavesta,’ c’est à dire, *parole vivante*.”—Vocabulaire des Anciennes Langues de la Perse, Pref. Zend. vol. ii, p. 423.

⁷ Id. vol. i, p. 89.

⁸ Thus, “And the Lord said unto Moses,” Exodus, passim. In the Zend, “Maintenant je parle clairement,” &c. Ha. xlv.

may be called forth by the questions of those holy men with whom He deigns to converse.⁹

The Hebrew books however, in conformity with their name, hold up *obedience to the laws* they publish as the condition which the Deity imposes upon His people, in return for the blessings which He has showered, and will continue to shower, upon them. In so far then as the Israelites are concerned, their observance or non-observance of their several articles of these covenants is the key to the divine economy as seen in the events of our world.¹ And, because Jehovah's priests are the ministers and interpreters of His will, they are necessarily therefore; first, *Historians* to connect passing events, the dispensations of Providence, with man's past conduct; and secondly, *Prophets*, in times of prosperity and of negligence in religious matters, to urge on the nation both the divine wrath and the ills that are preparing for sinners; and in times of adversity and oppression, and religious fervour, to rouse the people with the hopes of brighter days, to insist on the blessings promised them, and to connect those blessings with the name of some heavenly deliverer. Hence it is that the Hebrew scriptures, the Old Testament, consists principally of historical and prophetical books.

The Zendavesta, on the other hand, though it opens to our view the great scheme of Providence,² contains, in so far at least as they relate to particular events, no prophecies; and only so much of the history of the Zend people as accounts for their settlement in the country they once inhabited. It publishes its law, because it is the law of God, the law which has existed from all eternity,³ and the law

⁹ "And Moses inquired of the Lord." In the Zend, "Zoroaster consulta Ormuzd en lui disant, &c." Fargard, xi.

¹ Jeremiah xxxiv. 13, &c.

² e. g. That Ahriman and his Dews shall never destroy the creation of Ormuzd; that after a time they will lose all their power, and

be finally wholly conquered in the last times by Sosiosch, the last posthumous descendant of Zoroaster.

³ Thus Ormuzd is said to dwell "avec la science souveraine, et cette science souveraine, cette pureté production d'Ormuzd, est ce qu'on appelle la loi." Boun-Dehesch. § i, and the pure Hono-

which can alone make man pure of heart and pure of life and pure of deed;⁴ it shows us this law as the law of Ormuzd, and it occasionally therefore enters into the character and nature of the Deity⁵ as He is in Himself. And as man, from its particular view of the creation, is beset with unseen enemies, it reveals to him *the powerful word of Ormuzd*, by which he created and supports the worlds of lights, and before which the Dews sink as if annihilated⁶—it teaches him besides numerous prayers to and praises⁷ of the Deity, which are indeed *living words*, as they make man good, pure, and holy. The name of the Zend book accords then with its contents, and its contents are very naturally determined by its views of the Deity and of man.

The Hindu Scripture is called the Veda,⁸ or Book of Knowledge. Like the Old Testament and the Zendavesta, it lays claim to a divine origin; like them too it speaks of the creation of the world, and of man and beast, &c.; and like them it expatiates on the course of moral and religious action, by which man may hope to obtain the grace and favour of the Deity. From them however it differs in its form. It is *not* a narrative of different revelations written by him to whom they were made for the benefit of his fellow-men, but the very revelation itself,

ver existoit avant que le ciel eut été donné, &c.” Zend. vol. i, p. 139. Ha. xix.

⁴ “Ce Dew endort l’homme. Ne vous laissez pas surprendre; vous n’auriez pas les trois dispositions célestes, la pureté de pensée, la pureté de parole, la pureté d’action.” Farg. xviii. vol. i. p. 424.

⁵ Heis light, intelligence, science, &c. Ieschd d’Ormuzd, id. ii, p. 144. Of the Nosks or parts into which the Avesta is divided, “Sept traitoient du premier principe,” id. i, p. 479. A more detailed account of their contents Anquetil has given in the *Journal des Savans*, vol. i, p. 176, and Rhode has copied it. Heilige Sage d. Zend Volks.

⁶ “Si vous voulez, O Zoroaster, rendre malades et briser les Dews hommes, les magiciens, les Paris, les Dews qui affoiblissent, qui rendent sourds, ceux qui rendent aveugles, les couleuvres à deux pieds, les Aschmoghs à deux pieds, les loups à quatre pieds, l’armée nombreuse et impure qui arbore avec fierté une multitude de grands étendards, qui porte le drapeau cruel; prononcez mon nom dans tout son étendu, tous les jours et toutes les nuits, &c.” Ieschd d’Ormuzd, Zend. vol. ii. p. 116.

⁷ Ieschts and Izeschnes, *passim*.

⁸ “Veda, das Wissen.”—Von Bohlen, *Alt. Indien*, vol. i, p. 128.

the production of the Supreme God, which Brahme the great lawgiver translated from the devla or language of the gods into the Sanscrit or priestly language,⁹ and which, having inscribed on tablets of gold, he delivered over to four mounys or penitents, in order that they might communicate it to the Brahmins.¹

Like the Zendavesta however (and in this our Old Testament advantageously differs from both) it knows of worlds and spiritual beings whose existence or non-existence, though it may be matter of speculation for us, is beyond the reach of our knowledge. Like it too, though more fully, it treats of the very nature and essence of the divine mind. But though *in both* the creator is Intelligence and Light; yet, *as in the one* there are two creators, and as Ahriman is also Intelligent,—*this one, the Zendavesta*, was compelled to subsume Intelligence to Light, and Knowledge to Moral Purity; while, *as in the other* there is but one Creator, in whom all things subsist, who is indeed all things, earth and air, fire and water, light and darkness,—*that other, the Veda*, necessarily sees in Light but a portion and manifestation of the Creator; and because the Supreme Intelligence can alone appreciate and comprehend the infinite and infinitely varied existence of that Creator, in Intelligence it acknowledges “BRAHME the Great One.”²

Again, *the Veda*, as it allowed some truth in all creeds,

⁹ Rhode says Brahma was the translator: “Die Vedas hat *Birmah* verfasst, und Brahma der erste Gesetzgeber hat sie nur aus der Sprache der Devla oder Gotter, in die Samshada oder Sprach der Menschen übersetzt.”—Rhode, Heilige Sage.

¹ “Ces quatre livres merveilleux sont l'ouvrage du Dieu Brahme lui-même, qui les écrivit de sa propre main, sur des feuilles d'or. Il en révéla l'intelligence à quatre fameux mounys ou pénitens auxquels il les confia et les chargea de les ex-

pliquer aux Brahmes.”—Dubois, Mœurs des Indes, vol. i, p. 234.

² “He is Sudra, he is Praja'pati the Lord of Creatures; these gods are he, and so are the five primary elements, earth, air, the ethereal fluid, water, and light.... On intellect every thing is founded; the world is the eye of intellect, and intellect is its foundation. Intelligence is Brahme, the Great One.”—Asiat. Researches, vol. viii, p. 426. Again: “Omnis mundus, et illud quod in mundo est, omne in medio ejus est,” &c.—Oupnekhat, c. lxxxii.

some good in all men, was compelled to find the difference between creed and creed, and man and man, in the more or less perfect conception which each creed³ contained, or each man possessed, of the Deity; *in knowledge then, knowledge of God*,⁴ it finds all religion, all virtue; and to obtain that knowledge⁵ is, it declares, the great end and object of life. And that knowledge it professes to make known: hence its name.

The different views of these three Scriptures may be thus shortly characterized. The Old Testament, at least in its earliest books, represents religion as a compact entered into between man and the Deity, as something *legal and ceremonial*; and life as the period during which that compact holds good. In the Zend-Avesta, religion is a *moral and ceremonial* service, by which man ensures his own good and advances the kingdom of Ormuzd and weakens the power of Ahriman: with it life is a moment only; but a moment to the right employment of which are attached inexpressible rewards;—it is a moral combat, with heaven as the prize of the victor. In the Vedas, religion, *in its lowest form*, is the service and adoration of any Deity; *in its highest*, it is the true knowledge of God, the means to which are abstraction and meditation,—life with it is a mere jugglery, of which the ignorant are the dupes,—but which the wise use as a ladder to obtain supreme glory, *unification* with the Supreme Deity.

Verses 18-22. Here we find for the first time the boundaries of the promised land,—and these boundaries it was necessary to know. For the land of Canaan the Jews supposed to be peculiarly holy, both because it

³ Divisiones fidum, et religionum et rectitudo et derelictio (mundi) et præcepta.....omne ab eo productum est.”—Oup. p. 82.

⁴ “Quisquis omnia illa.....et seipsum et omnes existentias apparentes *Brahm* sciverit, is etiam cum locis superioribus ut pervenit, tem-

pore quo omnia corrupta fiant, is etiam cum ente, quod omne loco plenum est, unum fit.”—Id.c. lxvi.

⁷ “Brahme who is intellect..... is the best path to happiness for the generous votary who knows him and remains fixed in attention.”—Sir W. Jones’ Works, vol. vi, p. 448.

furnished holy things for the temple, and because neither the Shechinah nor the Sacred Spirit ever dwelt as they asserted on any person, even a prophet, out of this land. The country the Rabbins divided into three parts,—Judea, beyond Jordan, and Galilee; they thus excluded Samaria, which, as a country, so far as its fields, waters, dwellings and paths were concerned, was clean, but unclean by reason of its inhabitants.⁶ In India we find the same notions: there the sacred territory is also clearly defined; and whatever lies without its boundaries is, as formerly was the case among the Jews, considered impure and unholy,—even for instance the Deccan, though centuries have now elapsed since its inhabitants first embraced the religion of Brahma.⁷ Hetruria too, according to a fragment of an Etruscan cosmogony quoted by Michelet, seems to have claimed for itself a peculiar sanctity,—it is Jupiter's own land;⁸ so also Crete, as Jupiter's birth-place; Athens as Minerva's favourite city, &c.

But the inhabitants of a country are not satisfied with merely prizing and preferring their own country, they also prize and prefer themselves before other people—they hate or despise them. Thus, for the Jew the rest of mankind were but *Gentiles*; while for the Greeks and Egyptians, they were *Barbarians*.⁹ And, lest we should suppose that this self-complacency and contempt for others are the consequences of superior and acknowledged merit, we will but observe, that these feelings are at this day entertained by one of the most degraded races of the human species—the Esquimaux. Yes, the dwarfish Esquimaux, whose large heads and flat faces, prominent under-jaws, and dull and yellow eyes, render them hideous *in our sight*,

⁶ Calmet, Dict. art. *Canaan*.

⁷ Von Bohlen, das Alt. Indien, p. 9.

⁸ "Cum autem Jupiter terram Hetruriæ sibi vindicavit."—Hist. Rom. vol. i, p. 265, note.

⁹ "Endlich wird bey den Ægyptern ein grenzenloser Stolz, sich

im Gegensatze zu andern Nationen zu erheben bemerkbar, und sie allein haben für Auswärtige die Benennung *Barbaren* aufgebracht, die leider späterhin selbst die Griechischen Weisen geläufig wurde."—Von Bohlen, Id. ib. p. 60; Herod, lib. ii, § xv.

are models of beauty *in their own*.¹ They are the favoured descendants of a beneficent genius, while their dogs and all the other inhabitants of the earth are the produce of an evil spirit.² In nations, as in individuals, self-conceit and contempt for others are evidence of littleness and ignorance; they act upon both in the same way; they shut them out from all those humanizing advantages which frequent commerce with men of other views and other customs would naturally bring with it. They are barriers truly impregnable to all improvement.

This chapter is written with the name Jehovah.

Does this chapter narrate *one* or *two distinct* visions? The Lord appears to Abraham in the night, or at least before the sun has risen, while the stars are yet *shining* in the heaven, and, having promised him a numerous posterity, He then leaves him, and the vision is closed.—Or, before He leaves him, He alludes to Abraham's inheritance of Canaan; and when Abraham demands of Him a sign, He orders him to prepare a certain sacrifice. Morning now appears, and Abraham busies himself in choosing out the necessary animals, in slaying them, dividing them, and laying them one upon another. Ere the sacrifice is ready the day is far advanced, but not until the sun has gone

¹ "Les Esquimaux se distinguent par la petitesse de leurs pieds et de leurs mains et la grosseur énorme de leurs têtes: plus que hideux au jugement des Européens, ils sont parfaitement bien faits à leurs propres yeux, quoiqu'ils aient la face plate, la bouche ronde, le nez petit sans être écrasé, le blanc de l'œil jaunâtre, l'iris noir et peu brillant. Leur machoire inférieure dépasse celle d'en haut, et la lèvre en est aussi plus grosse et plus charnue," &c.—De Pauw, *Américains*, vol. i, part iii, § i, p. 262.

² "The Esquimaux say that their race originally sprung from a beneficent female spirit, and that

from another wicked female spirit are descended the other three creatures who inhabit the earth, viz. the Itkali or Indians, the Cabbunæ or Europeans, and, after long hesitation before they would express it, the dogs which they drive. The Itkali they abhor and speak of as murderers who never spare their tribes. Of the Cabbunæ they had only heard by report, never having seen a European till they encountered those in the *Fury* and *Hecla*; but it is clear from their classing them with the Indians and dogs that they have, that they have no very exalted idea of their virtues." —Parry's *Voyage*.

down is the sacrifice consumed. *In this last case*, this chapter would narrate the occurrences of a night, a day, and a portion of another night. In the former, any period of time may intervene between the visions.

Of this last vision Eichhorn views with suspicion, as addenda of the author of Genesis or of some later editor—

i. All that part of it which relates to the fate and fortunes of Abraham's descendants. For, first, it has the distinctness of history; and, secondly, it appears unnecessarily thrust in between Abraham's question and the answer to it,—the consumption of the sacrifice by fire from heaven.

ii. All that which relates to the boundaries of Canaan. For these boundaries are not in accordance with those set by Moses, nor with Joshua's plan of conquest. Only in the time of David did the kingdom of Israel extend to them. Eichhorn observes, moreover, that the people afterwards mentioned (Kenites, &c.) did not occupy the whole of Palestine, but only that part which was known as Canaan,—that part over which Abraham wandered,—and which Moses claimed for Israel and Joshua attacked.³

With this chapter we may connect that belief of the Israelites:

i. That the promises of God, though not immediately fulfilled, were certain of fulfilment.

ii. That it was lawful and permissible for them to ask of God some sign by which they might be assured that His promises would certainly be fulfilled. Thus Gideon obtains a sign in the dried fleece (Judges vi), Hezekiah in the retiring sun (2 Kings xx, 11); and following the example of their ancestors, (and though all Christianity is eager to stone them for it, I cannot blame them), the Pharisees demanded of Christ a sign from heaven, in order that they might know that he was the Messiah.

³ Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alt. Test.* § 419.

CHAPTER XIV.

GENESIS xvi. 1-16.

Verses 1, 2. With Sarah Abraham has no doubt often spoken of the promises of Jehovah; and though her name Jehovah has never mentioned, she has hitherto buoyed herself up with the hope that, through her, her husband would yet be blessed. But she is now old, and has no child; and she is content to be the mother, *by adoption*,¹ of Abraham's offspring. She therefore desires Hagar to supply her place in her husband's bed, in the belief that, by means of her handmaid (according to a custom which probably did not originate with Abraham, and which certainly prevailed with the later patriarchs, and still subsists in India² and China,³) she might obtain children.

¹ See the account of Juno's adoption of Hercules (Diod. Sic. lib. iv, c. x); and see also Michelet, Symbolique, p. 10-14.

² I conclude so, for the passage does not distinctly state this: "Si l'on voit," says Dubois, "des gens d'un rang inférieur vivre avec plusieurs femmes, une seule d'entre elles porte le titre et le nom d'épouse, les autres ne sont que des concubines. Dans plusieurs castes, les enfans qui naissent des dernières sont des bâtards; et si le père meurt sans avoir disposé d'une partie de ses biens en leur faveur, ils sont exclus du partage commun."—Mœurs des Indes, vol. i, p. 288.

³ In China: "L'épouse légitime est la seule censée mère de la famille; les fils des concubines lui appartiennent, elle a sur eux les mêmes droits que sur ses propres enfans, ils lui doivent les mêmes respects et le même obéissance. Ce n'est qu'en vertu de cette espèce de filiation et d'adoption qu'ils sont regardés comme de la famille et les frères de leurs frères; et encore la loi même les met-elle au dessous d'eux; quoiqu'ils soient les aînés, leurs cadets ont le pas avant eux dans les cérémonies, dans les assemblés, et dans tout ce qui a rapport à la vie civile." Doct. des Chin. sur la Piété Filiale, Mém. des Chinois, vol. iv, p. 289.

Verse 3. Sarai was now seventy-five years of age. She was ten years younger than Abraham,⁴ and consequently sixty-five when the promise of a numerous posterity and of the possession of Canaan was first made to her husband. If then of that posterity she hoped to be the mother, either the physical laws of women must *at that time* have been other than they *now* are, or the whole history of Abraham and Sarai, though I know the rationalists would explain it by some idiosyncrasy of constitution, was from their mid-age to their deaths a continued miracle.

Verses 4-6. Abraham has no authority over his own family. He suffers the handmaid to despise the mistress, and the mistress to avenge herself, and in no measured way, on the handmaid: throughout these transactions, he displays a weak and timid character. Such is the judgment *our age* must pass upon Abraham; but whether *his own* would so hardly judge him is another matter. Hagar is Sarai's maid,—her slave. To Hagar's services Sarai has a right,—over her life power. Sarai heaps on Hagar kindness, even honour: Hagar repays Sarai with contempt. As the mother of Abraham's future heir, she claims, if not to be the mistress of Abraham's household and the queen of his harem, to be at least the equal of his wife. Of these intrigues and quarrels in the women's apartments, Abraham,⁵ like other oriental lords, is ignorant, until made acquainted with them by Sarai, who appeals to his authority, and enquires whether her maid has his support and warranty. Abraham disavows the pretensions of Hagar, and at the risk of losing his child admits the right of Sarai over her own slave.⁶ Abraham

⁴ Vide chap. xvii. 17.

⁵ From the story of Rachel and the images (Gen. xxxi.), and the fact that Sarah is not present when Abraham entertains the three strangers (chap. xviii.), I conclude that the women lived apart from the men. If so, as in Jacob's family,

they must have had intrigues, &c. among themselves.

⁶ Sarah's right over her servant once allowed by Abraham, Sarah might treat Hagar as she pleased. Thus, when Amestris at the royal banquet asked of Xerxes her husband, to give her the wife of his

subsumes his hopes and his affections to his sense of justice. His view of the moral duties may be confined,—may not be such as ours,—but his observance of that which he conceived to be his duty is worthy of all admiration.

Verses 7-9. Those modern Palæphati, the rationalists, explain away the supernatural occurrences in this chapter, in the most natural manner possible. This angel of the Lord, say they—and they bid us remark that his appearance excites no surprise—is merely some stranger whom Hagar accidentally met at the well, and to whom she accordingly told all her grievances;—how she had been loved of her master, and how her mistress had grown jealous of her; and how, though she was indeed with child, she had run away from home to escape persecution. The stranger hears her tale, and very sensibly advises her to return, and submit herself into her mistress's hands; better that than starve in the wilderness;—and Hagar very sensibly follows his advice.

This explanation certainly does away with all that is miraculous in these occurrences, and must prove very satisfactory to those who dislike the unusual, the extraordinary; but to me it seems, that the gist of this tale is, not in the appearance of the angel nor in the advice given, but in the prophecy, which, while it discloses to Hagar the fortunes and the fate of her yet unborn son, at the same time makes known to her the presence of Jehovah. And that prophecy nevertheless we must, according to these men, look upon as a sort of moral merely, which the author of Genesis, having before his eyes the power and the character of the Ishmaelites, introduces by the way for the instruction and edification of the Hebrew people.⁷ But, though this book of Genesis certainly lays no claim to the

brother, Xerxes obliged by custom, though reluctantly, assented. He foresaw the treatment that awaited his sister-in-law; and having assented, he takes no precautions to prevent the cruelty of his wife,

which was worse than barbarous.—Herodotus, lib. ix, 110-112.

⁷ Eichhorn, Recensien v. E. F. C. Rosenmulleri Scholia in Vet Test. in Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur, vol. vi, p. 1023.

honours of inspiration, and though it may even be a collection of legends, which, in their tradition from father to son, acquired with each generation some new marvel,—yet, as its very end and purport is to show Jehovah's secret dealings with the family of Abraham, to reduce its miraculous interpositions to natural occurrences hyperbolically or poetically narrated, is to extract from the lemon its acidity, from sugar its sweetness, and to hold up what remains, the *caput mortuum*, as the real lemon and the real sugar. It is the play of *Hamlet* with the part of Hamlet left out. No: this book contains the religious views of a people, of an age; and as a religious book we must examine and judge it. We may refuse to accept its views, but we cannot alter them, or pare down its narrations till they square with our own notions of life or of the Deity.

Verses 11-12. To be told that the child for whom we have longed and prayed would be no better than a common, though a successful robber, and the father of robbers,—that he would live hated of men, and almost necessarily hating them,—would be *for us* no very consolatory intelligence. *Among the olden people* however another code of morality obtained; they took another and a more confined view of duty. They looked too much to results; and as these were in the hands of the Deity, success with them justified almost any means. Fate or Destiny too solved many of the difficult problems of life. It made any profession honourable. He who was “to the manner born” rejoiced in the occupation of his fathers. Thus in India at the present day, the caste of robbers in the Marava is a high caste;⁸ and formerly in Egypt, if we are to believe Dio-

⁸ “Les princes,” says Dubois, “sont de cette tribu, et la profession de voleur n’a rien d’infame, ni pour eux, ni pour aucun des individus qui composent la caste, parcequ’en volant ils sont censés faire leur devoir, et user seulement d’un droit inné. Ils ne rougissent nullement de leur caste; et lorsqu’on demande

à un *caller* à quelle tribu il appartient, il répond hardiment, ‘Je suis un voleur.’”—*Mœurs des Indes*, vol. i, p. 5. By the way, Haafner bears very different testimony to the morals of the Hindoos. He assures us that among them, the *only thieves by profession are the Europeans*.

dorus Siculus,⁹ the thief's was a regular and recognized calling,—a trade, having its corporation; and one, therefore, which, though not perhaps in high repute, had nevertheless its rights and privileges. And in Sparta, similarly, not theft but discovery was disgraceful. Hagar saw in this prophecy merely that she was to be the mother of a powerful people.

Verse 13. From this verse it should seem that this angel of Jehovah, whom Moses himself (ver. 7) calls "the angel of the Lord," but whom Hagar at first mistook for a mere man,—was Jehovah himself.¹ We may also observe that Hagar's exclamation, "Have I *also here* looked for thee!" implied surprise at meeting Jehovah in such a place; *in the house or tent* of Abraham she might have expected to see him; but *not here* in the desert.

This chapter is written with the name Jehovah, who here twice bears the title of Adonai²—Lord; a title which the Jews applied to their Deity exclusively. Like the other portions of Genesis written with the same name, it delights in etymologies. It gives us, for instance, the etymology:

1st. Of Ishmael—God heareth.

2ndly. Of the well, Beer-lahai-roi, the well of him that liveth and seeth; and

3rdly. It either associates with Hagar a story that corresponds with her name, which signifies flight or fugitive,³ or it gives Sarai's maid a name which corresponds with her story.

⁹ Lib. i, chap. xxviii, § ii. He says, that every one who wished to become a thief had but to inscribe his name on the books of *the captain of the thieves*, to whom he was obliged to carry every thing he stole. To the captain, all who were robbed applied; and on giving up one-fourth of the value of the article lost, it was restored to them.

¹ But Conf. Shumann ad h. l.

² Who would see the thousand mystic meanings of this word—for, in Hebrew, "a rose by any other name" does not "smell as sweet"—I refer to Glassii Philol. Sacra, c. de Ling. Heb. Necessitate. For the simple meaning of the word, to the art. Adonai, by Gesenius, Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop.

³ Gesenius art. Hagar. Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop.

Of the prophecy in this chapter we may observe, that though it is mentioned incidentally merely, it has been much more literally and strictly fulfilled than that other and principal prophecy which has been so often repeated and so solemnly sworn to,—viz. that prophecy which gave to the seed of Abraham (evidently meaning the seed of Abraham by Sarah) the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession.⁴

⁴ Vide xiii. 15, and xvii. 2. I have said, the seed of Abraham and Sarah. Such the prophecy clearly intends; for, in some measure, the Arabs, the descendants of Ishmael, may be said to inherit the land to this day,—though, indeed, they rather till and wander over it as serfs than possess it as free men.

CHAPTER XV.

GENESIS xvii.—1-27.

Verse 1. "I am the Almighty God." Elohim Schaddai. This is a name of the Deity, like Jehovah, according to Michaelis,¹—and *He* bears it in allusion to the Creation, according to the Rabbi Eliezer. "Extensi autem sunt cœli, atque progressi sunt, donec iis dixit: *sufficit*. Hinc etiam vocatur nomen ejus SCHADDAI, *sufficiens*; quia affatus est cœlos, *sufficit*, atque substituerunt."²

ALLMIGHT is the attribute of the Deity in most creeds. The Samojedes³ acknowledge a supreme God, the Creator of all things, and sovereignly good and beneficent. The Chang-ti or Tien of the Chinese is the supreme Emperor of Heaven, and supremely powerful.⁴ Ormuzd of Persia, "est celui qui actuellement peut tout."⁵ Zeus of Greece, we are told, *δυναται πάντα*, can all things; and Jupiter among the Romans, is Jupiter Omnipotens, Pater Omnipotens, &c.⁶ When however we remember, that Abraham smiled incredulously at the promise of the Almighty Elohim;⁷ that the Samojedes⁸ oppose to their supreme

¹ Comment. ad h. l.

² Anquetil du Perron, Dissertatio, p. 50, Oupnek'hat.

³ "Les Samojèdes admettent l'existence d'un être suprême, créateur de tout, souverainement bon et bienfaisant,.... Ils joignirent à cette idée, celle d'un être éternel et invisible, très puissant, quoique subordonné au premier, et enclin à faire

du mal."—Hist. Gen. des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 508.

⁴ Du Halde, Hist. de la Chine, vol. iii, pp. 3-6.

⁵ Ieschit d'Ormuzd, Zend, vol. ii, p. 145.

⁶ From Cudworth's Intellectual System, chap. iv, § iv.

⁷ Vid. verse 17 of this chapter.

⁸ Vide note ⁹, supra.

and beneficent Deity, a supreme and maleficent Spirit; that with the Tien the earth is coeval; that Zeus or Jupiter cannot break the decrees of fate, that he is himself subject to imperious necessity;⁸ and that Ormuzd though he shall eventually conquer, cannot immediately destroy the terrible Ahriman—we must feel that between an *attribute allowed* and an *attribute possessed*, there is a material difference. And though the disbelief of Abraham only evidences *his own narrow conceptions of*, but no way impugns, the Elohim's infinite power—yet as in the other cases above cited, the Omnipotence which each creed attributes to its Deity would, if literally understood, make of that creed a jumble of contradictions; we must, if we do not limit its meaning, regard it, either as an hyperbolical compliment, a sweet incense of flattery which man offers to his God, or as one of those instances of illogical absurdity of which infant man has no fear.

ALLMIGHT cannot be the attribute of any being independently of whose will any other thing or being exists. For

1. If any thing is independently of the Deity, and

1st. If any event happen either without His command or contrary to His wish, then the Deity is evidently not Almighty.

And 2dly. If a *chaos* or *matter*, as the Jews, Chinese, Greek philosophers, &c. believe, has existed from all eternity: then as it must have so existed, because its creation was out of the power or province of the Deity—and as it must have so existed moreover, *necessarily* possessing certain inherent qualities which, though the Deity might turn them to use, mould them to certain purposes, He could not destroy because He did not give; then also is the Deity not Almighty.

⁸ “Esse quoque in *fatis* reminiscitur affore tempus
Quo mare, quo tellus, correptaque *Regia Cæli*
Ardeat et mundi moles operosa laboret.”—Ovid. *Metam.* lib. i.

And see the whole policy of Olym- Jupiter and Juno, concerning Sar-
pus, in this conversation between pedon, *Iliad*, xvi, 433, &c.

And II. If any other Being exist independently of Him whom we reverence as the Deity ; and

If, *first*, that Being be not co-eternal with the Deity, but have merely sprung into existence without His sanction : then, as there are evidently causes at work, which are *either beyond the Deity's prevention or out of the sphere of His knowledge*, the Deity is either simply not Almighty, or not Almighty because not all-knowing.

If however, secondly, that Being be co-eternal with the Deity : then as both cannot be infinitely wise and powerful, &c., or, they would then both have one character, one will, and be consequently not two but one and the same being : one of them must be inferior to the other. And as *that one* cannot have, though in a less degree, exactly the same attributes as *this other*, and exactly the same sphere of operation, without being included in Him ; He must therefore have other attributes, another will, another sphere of operation, and must in some measure limit, or get without the will of Him of whom we would suppose Allmight an attribute, which is impossible.

And if, *thirdly*, this second Being be co-eternal with the Deity, but opposed to Him in character, will, and attributes ; then, as this Being's will is independent of the Deity, though over him the Deity may have power, as a master over a slave, yet over His will He has no more control than man has over the will of man. The Deity may torture and heap mountains on him, may create a hell for him, may eventually destroy him,—but his will is there, an everlasting monument that the God with whom he waged unequal war is not Almighty.

We will now examine how far the Allmight attributed to the Deity, in the three great creeds to which we have principally confined ourselves, is consistent with their several doctrines of the cause and origin of evil.

According to the Hindus⁹ the Great Eternal *created by*

⁹ From a German translation and abstract of Holwell's translation of the Schastah of Brahmah. Holwell's I have vainly tried to procure. In his *Rel. Bild. d. Hindus*, Rhode has given the whole of this

his will and out of his own nature a number of spiritual beings, who were, *according to their own free choice*, either capable of reaching to perfection, or liable to prefer the imperfect. He created first Brahma, Vishnu and Schiva, then Moisasur and the army of spirits. The highest place he gave to Brahma; Brahma he made lord over the angels, and Vishnu and Schiva were his councillors.

And the Eternal divided the spirits into principalities and powers, and over each class he set a chief; and, according to their worth and dignity, they prayed round the throne of the Eternal: and harmony was in heaven. At length however Moisasur and Rhabun the next to him in rank, through envy and jealousy turned to evil, and seduced away the powers under them, and they all did evil in the sight of the Eternal, and they refused him their homage, and said one to the other, "We will rule."

And the Eternal whose *knowledge* and *providence* and *influence* extended over all things, the acts of those beings excepted whom he had created free,¹ saw this rebellion with grief and anger. But, merciful even in his wrath, he bid Brahma and Vishnu and Schiva show the fallen spirits their sin, and call them back to their duty—but they were hardened in evil. And now the Eternal armed Schiva with his almighty power and urged him to drive the rebels from heaven, and to plunge them into the abyss of darkness and unspeakable woe.

Here sighed the fallen angels. But for their forgiveness and reinstatement they who had stood firm and continued true ceased not to pray the Eternal. And the Eternal was moved by their prayers, and though *he could not presuppose* (Er nicht voraussetzen konnte) that his mercy would have its due effect on the rebel spirits, yet in the hope that they might do penance, he decreed that they should be

Shastah. I can but refer to it, as I have received this work at the last hour, and have only time to hastily run over it.

¹ "Der Ewige dessen Allwissenheit, Vorherwissenheit und Einfluss

sich über alle Dinge erstreckt ausser über die Handlungen der von ihm freigeschaffenen Wesen."—Rhode, ü. d. Werth einige Urkunden d. Morgenlandes; and see note ⁸, p. 111.

forthwith set free from the depths of darkness, and placed in some state of trial where they would be enabled to work out their own salvation and happiness. And for this purpose he set apart fifteen worlds.

And in the lowest of the fifteen worlds Vischnu was ordered to place the spirits, and they were given bodies as prisons, in which according to their crimes they were subjected to all natural ills, to accidents, and death, and renewal in various forms. And as ambition was the first sin of the heads and chiefs of the angels, though they were not refused the mercy of the Eternal, yet was their power of evil increased, and they were doomed to wander through eight worlds, and, as heretofore, the inferior spirits were made subject to their temptations. And according as *the one* made use of their powers of evil to induce *the others* to ill, so were their punishments increased and their after trials made more severe; and as *the others* more or less resisted the temptations which were thrown in their way, so was their chance of pardon rendered more or less certain.

In this legend we may observe, that the Eternal, as Creator, is Almighty; but that he not merely creates beings to whom he gives a will of their own, but also places those beings, in so far at least as they are agents, beyond the sphere of his influence. He *was* Almighty, but by his creation *ceased to be so*.

According to the Zend creed, Ahriman is coeval with Ormuzd. He is evil embodied: his dwelling was in the thick darkness; there he lay grovelling till the beams of Ormuzd's glorious creation stirred him to envy, and called into play his wicked energies:—that creation he rushed forward to spoil and destroy; but its beauty and its grandeur terrified him, and he skulked back to his foul abyss and spawned there Dews and Daroudjs, which, like their father, are evil, frightful, and breathing rottenness.

And now Ormuzd, to save his own worlds of light, offers Ahriman peace.—If Ahriman will respect the creation of Ormuzd, his own progeny shall be immortal.—

Ahriman refuses these terms, and declares war to the last day.

The *first part* of this myth, the hate of Ahriman, his horror and fear of every thing that is good, is finely imagined.

The *second part*, however, displays all the vice of the Zendavesta's double creation. For though good is to the death as much the enemy of evil as evil is of good, yet as in this creed evil is coexistent with good, Ahriman with Ormuzd; and as Ahriman is not Ormuzd's creature, but is like Ormuzd himself a creator, and like Ormuzd strong and mighty; before his power Ormuzd may very fairly be conceived almost to tremble: with him he holds divided empire; with him he is forced, even against his wish, to fight for supremacy; and though in the end he is to gain complete and assured victory, he suffers in the mean while many and severe overthrows. Ormuzd *never was*, like the Hindu Eternal, almighty.

The Satan of the later Jews³ and Christians,—save that he contends for man alone, that the human soul is his only prey,—partakes of the Ahriman of the Zend, and the Moisasur of the Hindu, creed. Like them he stands forth as the rival and adversary of God; like them he fights with God for God's creatures; and like them is often conqueror. *On the one hand*, however, he differs from the Persian Ahriman, in that he is, *like the Hindu Moisasur*, a created being; and that *like him* he was created pure and good; that *like him* too he was once chief among the hea-

² "Ormuzd, qui scait tout, se leva. Il vit le peuple d'Ahriman, peuple effrayant, ne respirant que pourriture, mauvais.....Cependant Ormuzd, qui scavoit de quelle manière l'œuvre du Pectiare Ahriman devoit à la fin se terminer, *lui offrit la paix*, en lui disant: 'O Ahriman, secours le monde que j'ai créé, respecte-le; et ce que tu as produit sera immortel, ne vieillira pas, ne se corrompera pas, ne man-

quera pas.' Alors Ahriman répondit: 'Je renonce à toute liaison; je ne secourerai pas votre peuple; je ne le respecterai pas; je ne m'unirai avec vous pour aucune œuvre pure. Je tourmenterai votre peuple tant que les siècles dureront. Moi, qui suis l'ennemi de toutes vos productions, je ferois amitié avec vous!' — Boun-Dehesch, Zendavesta, vol. ii, p. 346.

³ Warburton's D. Leg. vi, § 2.

venly host; and *like him* sinned against his creator; and *like him* was hurled to the dark pits of hell. But, *on the other hand*, unlike Moissasur and *like Ahriman*, in the bottomless pit is still his habitation; *like Ahriman*, he himself prowls forth, or sends out his troops of subject spirits, to plague men with disease and misfortune,⁴ or to tempt them to crime; *like him* too he wages a war with heaven, in which heaven only can be the loser: like him, he can draw God's children from their allegiance, while his own angels are for ever excluded from God's presence;⁵ and, *like him* also, he rejoices not in sin merely, but also in the sinner's torment: for though hell is his place of banishment, *like Ahriman* he is king of hell.

Of these several conceptions of the principle of evil, *the Persian*, though the most at variance with the omnipotence attributed to the Deity, is the boldest and the most logical.⁶ Evil, *it tells us*, is Ahriman's nature—his good. He torments all pure creatures, because he hates purity;

⁴ As in the case of Job; and Luke xiii. 16.

⁵ The eternity of the Ormuzd creed must be taken *cum grano salis*. Like the coquettes, of it we may ask,

"What day next week th' eternity shall end?"

It lasts only "tant que les êtres dureront"—after which all things return into the bosom of Zeruane Akerene—Time without bounds, *i.e.* Nihilism. After twelve thousand years, moreover, Ahriman will be either destroyed by Ormuzd, or he and all his Dews will become pure;—but this, not on account of the war with Ahriman, but because it has been so decreed.

⁶ The most logical, only in so far as it makes the evil principle independent of the good, as in Ha. xlv, vol. i, p. 193, where Ahriman, "au commencement du monde céleste," thus addresses Ormuzd: "O vous qui êtes l'excellence, je

suis le crime même"—but not in so far as it afterwards converts or turns that evil principle to good. (Ha. xxx.) For that which is in its nature, essence, evil, may be annihilated, but cannot be made good. Darkness, when, as in the Zend, it is something positive, cannot be changed into light—it is destroyed by light. The conversion of Ahriman presupposes that *evil* in him is accidental,—his choice merely; that he was created good, and with a nature capable of good,—a view which is also found in the Zend. Thus Ha. xix. "Le céleste Ormuzd prononça l'Honover; moi céleste, j'opérai; et le chef du mal ne fut plus. Il dit au milieu des Darvands,—il dit dans le Douzakh, 'Je ne penserai pas le bien; je ne le dirai pas; je ne serai pas intelligent. Je ne veux ni me soumettre, ni parler, ni agir; je renonce à la loi; mon âme, qui existe, ne reconnoît pas cette parole.'"

and he tempts man to do him service, to sin, because he thus weakens the power of Ormuzd and enlarges his own dominion. *It accounts* for the origin of evil by assuming its co-existence with good. Not so the Hindu and *Judaico-Christian* creeds: they account, *not* for the origin of evil itself, but for the evil in this our world. For,

1. As regards the Hindu faith. Because Moisasur sinned, this world and our bodies were created as prisons for the fallen angels, and the soul therefore comes to inhabit them already steeped in sin. So far good. But when we ask, how came Moisasur to sin? The Hindu books attempt to answer the question by supposing, that the Eternal created his angels *in part perfect, in part imperfect*, and that having created them free he withdrew from them the controul of his influence; they therefore sinned without his foreknowledge—and yet sinned because they had been created to sin, because they had been created faulty. The Hindu creed leaves the origin of sin still a mystery, and strives to be consequent at the expense of the Deity's omniscience and omnipotence. And similarly

The Judaico-Christian mythology informs us that Satan and his legions sinned, and because they sinned were driven from heaven. And if we ask how Satan came to sin, we are told that God created the angels with a will of their own, a choice, and that, in consequence of that will, many of them chose evil, and having power over us, tempt us to do likewise. Satan then was the first sinner; but if Satan, an angel, chief among the choir of heaven, sinned, untempted, why may not we? Wherefore then this thick cloud of

“ Black spirits and white,
Red spirits and grey”?

this cumbersome machinery of devils which, though it may give interest to a poem or a play, suits little with the known manifestations of God's providence? Besides, if the Deity created His angels with a power of choice, a will to choose between good and evil, if He Himself knew good

and evil,⁷ evil already existed, in thought at least. Whence then evil?

All these embodiments of evil are besides liable to objection.

1. Because by them evil is placed before us as something positive, whereas it is a want: as of health, whence physical pain: of knowledge, whence low and narrow views of right, a selfish morality, and of self-discipline; whence inability to act up to our standard of right, our morality. To Evil these creeds give strength, strength and power, not merely to fight against Good, but to overcome her. Good is weak before her enemy; and though she fights with divine might and divine weapons, she shrinks from the combat which she should herself provoke. Like the fabled knights of old let her go in the face of day against the fiend. His puny enchantments, his airy monsters, his jabbering spectres, fade away before her indomitable will. As she moves, weakness gathers strength; what was scattered or fallen is united or built up; from her eyes beam light and happiness; law and order flow from her lips; and at every word she utters, at every lesson, whether of science or of morals, that she teaches the listening nations, she strikes down and treads to the earth and annihilates some one of the infinite spawn of the ever-worsted Ahri-man. Yes, evil is in the world: why, we know not, nor shall discover: but because all that *is*, and ever *can*, and *shall be*, *is* and *must be*, God's work; because as the one self-existent and sole Creator, God is necessarily Almighty;⁸

⁷ "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."

⁸ Cudworth, ut supra, cites from Aristotle a Greek poet to the effect "that nothing is exempted from the power of God, but only this,—that He cannot make that *not* to have been, which hath been: i.e. do what implies a contradiction." I remember too a sermon or treatise of (Charnock's?)—(I write hesitatingly, for I have not seen it since

I was fifteen), the purport of which was to show what things are impossible, even to Omnipotence. All such speculations are, it seems to me, out of our province; they are all based too on the supposition that the laws of our mind are the only possible laws; but as those laws God imposed upon us, how know we that he might not have imposed altogether different ones?

it is there we humbly believe by God's will, and in furtherance of the great schemes of God's providence.

And II. Because they tend to sensualize the Deity. To evil, are ever opposed good, angels. We see God on His throne surrounded by cherubim and seraphim, through whom He hears the prayers and provides for the wants of mankind, and whom He sends forth as the ministers of His will, to protect His servants and fulfil His commands. We think too of the evil spirits as lurking about our world, hiding in our homes, and when the eye of God or of His angels is not on them, sallying forth to do man mischief, and to thwart the course of God's law. With views like these how can any pure, although imperfect, knowledge of God ever exist? What becomes of His infinite power, or goodness, or providence? They are reduced to empty names; and the Deity is degraded to a Persian sovereign, who dwells in the innermost recesses of his palace, while his satraps govern his armies and his provinces.⁹

"I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect." Though we will not venture to enumerate the characteristics which are *essentially distinctive* of a revelation, we will, in reference to the noble precept before us, cursorily note some of the conditions which *every doctrine professing to be revealed* should fulfil, although we must, at the same time, acknowledge that the fulfilment of these conditions is no evidence of a revelation.

I. Every such revelation then must be couched in terms, or made in a tone which is intelligible to those for whom it is intended. If it should be addressed to simple men, it must be expressed in sincere, and plain, and simple language. For to such men, the bitter irony of Voltaire or of Swift would be sober earnest, and the abstraction of metaphysics a ridiculous jargon.

II. It must tell man something he did not know before. Heaven comes not down to earth, to speak to us of truths

⁹ Thus, in Tobit, Raphael says of himself: "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels which pre- sent the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One."—Tobit xii. 15.

which we may gather on every bush, commonplaces which are in every mouth; but to tell us of something we had not perceived,—of which we were ignorant;—something we could not ourselves discover.

III. It must speak to the common sense of those to whom it is addressed; it must be reasonable in their eyes, suitable to their capacity and state of civilization. It must contain a *truth for them*, or they will reject it as absurd and impossible. For instance, there are savages in Africa¹ who, because gunpowder and muskets and shoes and stockings do not grow wild in their country, regard their God as a black and mischievous and vindictive being. Let us now suppose that to these men we speak of a religion which promises inward peace and content and joy to all who truly love and serve the Deity, but which leaves wealth, power, &c., the probable rewards of industry, prudence and worldly wisdom, as well to the irreligious as the religious man: how would these men receive our words?² They would laugh us to scorn.³ As earthly good is their only good, as spiritual good they know not of, the God and the religion we preached to them would in their eyes be nothing worth. To these people, a pure revelation therefore, Christianity for instance, could not be made,

¹ "Leur Dieu étoit noir et méchant; il prenoit plaisir à leur causer mille sorte de tourmens; au lieu que celui des Européens étoit un très bon Dieu, puisqu'il les traitoit comme ses enfans." Why the European God is a good God, we learn: "Dans leurs idées on n'a besoin en Europe ni de travail ni d'industrie pour se procurer toutes sortes de commodités; et la prédication de Dieu pour les blancs leur fait trouver toutes leurs richesses au milieu des champs."—Hist. Gen. des Voyages, vol. iv, liv. ix, § vii, p. 155.

² When Franklin told one of the Angetkooks, or conjurors of the Esquimaux, of a Deity who was every where, the Angetkook rushed away, and hid himself in terror.

³ For instance, Socrates, when he compels Crito to admit that never is injustice other than evil, and that therefore man must never repay injustice with injustice, evil with evil, as the many think—ὥς δὲ πολλοὶ οἰονται—bids him at the same time beware how he assents to this doctrine, as he will find it neither then nor at any other time a popular one—οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ολίγοις τισι ταῦτα γὰρ δοκεῖ καὶ δοξεῖ.—Plato in Crito. How little Socrates foresaw that this morality so despised in his day, and which seems to have escaped the notice of Xenophon, (for we can find no trace whatever of it in his Memorabilia) would hereafter be in the mouth of every field preacher!

for it could not without long preparation be received or even rendered intelligible to them.

iv. Every such revelation, because it is from God, must contain not merely a truth for the people to whom it is addressed, but a truth for their posterity, for all time ; its doctrine must be eternally and universally true ; and while therefore that doctrine takes many different hues, and wears many shapes, according to the different ages, and different states of civilization, and even different characters which receive it,—it appears still ever suggestive of other truths, still inexhausted and inexhaustible, and still expansible to infinity. It stands ever before us as some great problem which Humanity in its long life can alone fully work out and solve.

All these conditions this grand precept fulfils. It is a principle, a motive for moral conduct intelligible even to savages ; and yet within itself it contains the germs of a large and Christian morality. It speaks to all ages and times ; the child feels its truth ; it enters into the faith of the negro,⁴ and before its grandeur the philosopher stands abashed.

Verse 2. How lame a conclusion, alas, to how grand a beginning ! “ I will make my covenant between me and thee and multiply thee exceedingly.” He, who but now was the God of the universe, dwindles down into the Fetisch of the Gold Coast negro—and naturally enough. Among infant people, the earthly and the sensual, however they may be a moment thrown into the shade by some distant glimpse of the eternal and the spiritual, soon reclaim their wonted empire. It is not God, the infinitely good and powerful, they care to worship,—but God, as the giver of good things. Hence where many Gods are wor-

⁴ *e. g.* “ Les nègres de la Côte d’Or, suivant Bosman, ont dans leurs maisons un Fétiche, auquel ils croient les yeux sans cesse ouverts sur leur conduite, pour récompenser leurs bonnes actions, et pour punir leurs mauvaises. Ils font consister cette récompense dans le nombre de leurs femmes et de leurs esclaves, et la punition dans la perte de ces biens.”—*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, p. 160.

shipped, not the greatest and the holiest God is the most worshipped, but he who will most favour his worshippers. Hence in the middle ages the devotion which was paid to miracle-working saints and relics of saints, a devotion which superseded the worship of God.⁵ And hence too Moses (perhaps because he himself so conceived of the Deity, or perhaps because he knew all the weakness and sensuality of his nation and therefore subdued his own lofty spirit to the spirit of his age) a second time closes the short but rich view which he gives the Israelites of pure religion, with promises of blessings which they could better understand and more prized. He shows them God as they themselves desired to see Him, and he thus withdraws from them every pretext for the worship and acknowledgment of other Gods.

Verses 3-14. The Elohim changes the name of Abram, from Abram, sublime father, to Abraham, father of multitudes. He then enters into a covenant with Abraham, by which He promises to make him the father of nations and of kings, and to give to his descendants Canaan for an everlasting possession; but in return demands that Abraham and his posterity on their parts circumcise the flesh of their foreskin in token of the covenant betwixt Him and them.

This covenant imposes circumcision on the descendants of Abraham. As this seems however to have been a rite which other nations observed in common with the Jews, much dispute has arisen as to the people with whom it originated. We will therefore endeavour to ascertain what nations besides the Jews practised this rite—the extent to which it prevailed among them—and its supposed objects and original.

⁵ Of the shrine of Thomas-à-Becket, Michelet relates: "Selon une tradition, on aurait, en un an, offert jusqu'à 950 livres sterlings à la chapelle de St. Thomas, tandis que l'autel de la Vierge ne reçut que quatre livres. *Dieu lui-même*

n'eut pas une offrande."—Histoire de France, vol. ii, pp. 345-6. See Rapiu, vol. i. p. 818, book xv, note, who from the ledger book of the offerings gives the exact sums. In confirmation of this account, vide Burnet, vol. i. p. 244, & Stowe, p. 576.

Sanchoniatho (supposed by some to be a cotemporary of Gideon, by others of Solomon) is the first profane author who speaks of circumcision. He tells us that on occasion "of a plague with a great mortality, Chronus offered up his only begotten son as a sacrifice to his father Ouranus, and circumcised himself and compelled his allies to do the same."⁶ From Herodotus we learn, that circumcision was practised by the Colchians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Syrians of Palestine, and, though still in use, was then (450 B. C.) beginning to be discontinued by the Phenicians,⁷ especially those who had any intercourse with the Greeks.

⁶ Vide Cory's Ancient Fragments, p. 10.

⁷ Μουννοι παντων ανθρωπων Κολχοι και Αιγυπτιοι και Αιθιοπες περιταμνονται απ' αρχης τα αιδοια. Φοινικες δε και Συροι οι εν τη Παλεστινη, και αυτοι ομολογουσι παρ Αιγυπτειων μεμαθηκεναι. Συροι δε οι περι Θερμωδοντα και Παρθενιον ποταμον, και Μακρωνες οι τουτοισι αστυγειτονες εοντες, απο Κολχων φασι νεωστι μεμαθηκεναι.... αυτων δε Αιγυπτειων και Αιθιοπων ουκ εχω ειπειν οκοτεροι παρα των ετερων εξεμαθον..... ως δεπιμισγομενοι Αιγυπτω εξεμαθον, μεγα μοι και τοδε τεκμηριον γινεται. Φοινικων οκοσοι τη Ελλαδι επιμισγονται, ουκετι Αιγυπτιους μιμεονται κατα τα αιδοια, αλλα των επιγινομενων ου περιταμνουσι τα αιδοια. Herod. lib. ii. s. 104.

Calmet, however (art. Circumcision), informs us "that those who assert that the Phenicians were circumcised, mean probably the Samaritans; for we know from other authority," what he does not deign to mention, "that the *Phenicians did not* observe this ceremony." Surely Calmet overlooks the testimony of Sanchoniatho, which alone is of little weight, but which receives authority from, and gives it to, the evidence of Herodotus. Sanchoniatho accounts for a rite which in

his day obtained somewhere, and he tells us that the inventor of the rite was a Phenician king and god. Some centuries after, Herodotus calls the Phenicians a circumcised people. Surely there can be little doubt but that the Phenicians to whom he alludes, are the Phenicians of Sanchoniatho. Moreover, the Phenicians of Herodotus are a people who, he tells us, were in habits of intercourse with the Greeks (vide Josephus cont. Apion, i, § 12) and that Greek opinion had influence over them. Is this, I ask, applicable to the Samaritans, who were unknown to the Greeks till the time of Alexander? (Vide Marsham, Canon Chron. sec. ix, p. 144.)

Again, Ammonius, (Calmet's authority?) speaking of the Idumæans as Phenicians—and Witsius understands him of the Phenicians of Herodotus—uses, according to Prideaux, these words: "Judæi sunt qui a naturâ ita fuerunt ab initio. Idumæi non fuerunt Judæi ab initio, sed *Phœnices et Syri*, a Judæis autem superati, et, ut circumciderentur, et in unam cum iis gentem coirent, et eisdem legibus subderentur adacti, Judæi sunt nominati."—Connection, vol. iii, p. 366. Now from Josephus, Ant. l. xiii, c. 17, we learn that the

Philo-Judæus⁸ speaks of it as a rite sedulously observed by many nations and more especially by the Egyptians. Josephus⁹ confirms the testimony of Herodotus as regards the Egyptians. And that the Egyptians practised and held circumcision in honour the Bible itself seems to admit: for Joshua (chapter v. 8, 9) after the Israelites have been circumcised, represents the Lord as saying, "This day have I rolled away *the reproach* of Egypt from you." In Jeremiah moreover (chapter ix, 25, 26) according to Michaelis (I must own, however, that his interpretation of the passage, though it accords tolerably well² with his translation of it, seems to me somewhat forced), we find an enumeration of several circumcised people, which besides the Egyptians and the Jews, includes the Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites and Arabs of the wilderness.

Through the Arabians and the Jews this rite, we may observe, has survived even to this day—both people still practise circumcision; and through the Arabians, who derive the custom from their ancestor Ishmael, it has

Idumeans were conquered by Hyrcanus, and by him compelled either to submit to the Jewish laws and customs, or to quit their country. Many preferred submission. As this, however, happened about 129 B.C., it could scarcely be to them that Herodotus, 450 B.C., alluded. I think we must conclude then that the Phenicians of Herodotus were real Phenicians, Phenicians of Tyre, and Sidon, and Byblus. We must observe, however, that when he speaks of these people as *circumcising*, he speaks of them also as beginning to discontinue the custom; and consequently, neither in Diodorus Sic. chap. i, part i, § xxviii, nor in Strabo, are they mentioned among the circumcising nations. In the same way, the Idumeans seem at one time to have circumcised, (Jeremiah xx) and to have afterwards dropped the practice, till they were again compelled to it by Hyrcanus.

⁸ Περιτομή, πραγμα σπουδαζομενον ου μετρίως και περι ετεροις εθνεσι, και μαλιστα τω αιγυπτιακῳ. —Phil. Judæus, περι περιτομης, p. 810, ed. Turneb.

⁹ Quotes Herodotus, ut supra, cont. Apion. lib. i, § xxii.

¹ Mosaiches Recht, § v, p. 184, which with Hoffman's art. *Beschneidung*, Ersch & Gruber Encyclop.; Witsius *Ægyptiaca*; Spenser, *De Legibus Heb.*; and Marsham, *Canon Chron.*, I have freely consulted and made use of.

² "Es kommen Zeiten spricht Jehova, da ich über alle Beschneitenen die Vorhaut haben, Gericht halten will!"—"Behold the days come that I will hold judgment over all the circumcised who are uncircumcised," &c. — Uebersetz. d. Bibel. But surely the Ammonites and Moabites were not circumcised: see Deuteronomy xxiii. 3 and 7; and Marsham's *Canon Chron.* p. 168; and Judith xiv. 5-10.

established itself among all the professors of the Moham-
medan religion, Asiatic and African, and in Africa has
spread even amid the neighbouring people, as the Abyssin-
ians and Caffres. But not only in the Old World, and
not only among nations who were more or less in habits of
intercourse one with the other, has circumcision obtained,
it was known also to the inhabitants of the new Conti-
nent. Captain Cook³ found it practised by the islanders
of the Pacific; and De Solis⁴ relates, that among the
Mexicans "New-born infants were brought up to the altar,
and there with a thorn of Maguey or a lancet of flint the
priests drew some blood from the privy parts, after which
they either sprinkled them with water or dipped them
into it."

We shall now examine the extent to which this rite
prevailed among these several nations. Among the Jews
we find that every male descendant of Abraham, conse-
quently all Israelites, must be circumcised, and with them,
all bought, and born, slaves (ver. 12, 13). We find also,
when Abraham has grown into a nation, a provision made
(Exod. xii, 44-48) for the naturalization of strangers; all
who will be circumcised and keep the passover, shall be as
those that are born in the land.⁵ Circumcision gave the
stranger a right to partake of the passover, and his joining
in that feast was considered an evidence that he had become
one of the nation. To use modern language, circumcision
gave the stranger the freedom of the state, and the keeping
the passover showed merely that he had taken up that
freedom. Children were circumcised eight days after their
birth: purchased slaves and foreigners, *the one* when they
were bought, *the other* immediately on their desire to natu-

³ Cook's Voyage, vol. i, ii.

⁴ De Solis, Conquest of Mexico. These lancets of flint remind me of Joshua's "knives of flint." See marginal reading (chap. v. 3), and the *λιθον Αιθοπικον* used by the Egyptians in embalming (Diod. Sic. lib. i, c. xci.); and see also De Pauw, Recherches sur les Améri-

cains, part. iv, § iv.

⁵ And thus it was probably "that many of the people of the land became Jews" in Esther viii. 17. The provisions in Exodus for the naturalization of foreigners, no doubt the original law, seem to have been revised and limited by the subsequent law of Deuter. xxiii.

ralize as Jews. Among the Jews then, circumcision appears as the great national symbol, which all without exception⁶ were obliged to take upon themselves.

Of the Egyptians, Herodotus tells us merely, that they circumcised; Strabo and Ambrosius⁷ that they circumcised their children of both sexes, and circumcised them, adds Ambrosius (*nescio unde edoctus*, observes Marsham) in their fourteenth year. Philo-Judæus says generally, that they held circumcision in high honour; but Josephus⁸ speaks of it as a rite, which in Egypt was regarded as obligatory on the priest class only, though it was not therefore limited to that class. Clemens⁹ informs us, that to be initiated into the mysteries of the Egyptian priests Pythagoras underwent circumcision; and Origen¹ affirms that no one in Egypt could devote himself to the study of astronomy or geometry or hieroglyphics, or become a priest or sooth-

⁶ This is not to be understood quite literally. For "Lightfoot informs us that the frequent mortality this rite occasioned, produced a standing order, that when any person lost three children successively by the operation, he was to be excused from circumcising the rest; in consequence of which there were actually many uncircumcised among them, who in these circumstances were esteemed still to be in all points as good Israelites and even as perfect priests as the rest."—From Middleton, Letter to Waterland, Works, vol. ii, p. 158.

⁷ Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, vol. iv, § clxxxv; and Marsham, *Canon. Chron.* p. 74 and 168. Most probably Strabo refers to the Arabians, who to this day circumcise both sexes.

⁸ Cont. Apion. lib. ii, § xiii: Καὶ μὴν εἰ τις αὐτὸν ἤρετο, τῶν πάντων Αἰγυπτίων τινὰς εἶναι καὶ σοφωτάτους καὶ θεοσεβείας νομίζει, πάντως αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσει, τοὺς ἱερεῖς, δύο γὰρ αὐτοὺς φασὶν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων ἐξ ἀρχῆς ταῦτα προστεταχθαι, τὴν αὐτῶν θεῶν Σεραπειαν, καὶ τῆς

σοφίας τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, ἐκεῖνοι τοὺν ἅπαντες καὶ περιταμνόνται.

⁹ From Marsham, *Canon. Chron.* p. 73: "Pythagoras cum Ægyptiorum prophetis congressus esse, dicitur, δι' οὗς καὶ περιετέμνετο, ἵνα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἀδύνατα κατελθὼν, τὴν μυστικὴν παρ' Αἰγυπτίων ἐκμαθοῖ φιλοσοφίαν. (Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i, cap. cccii.)

¹ "Apud Ægyptios inquam nullus aut geometriæ studebat, aut astronomiæ, quæ apud illos præcipuè ducuntur, nullus certe astrologiæ et geneseos, qua nihil divinius putant, secreta rimabatur, nisi circumcissione suscepta. Sacerdos apud eos, aruspex, aut quorumlibet sacrorum minister, vel, ut illi appellant, propheta omnis, circumciscus est. Literas quoque sacerdotes veterum Ægyptiorum, quas hieroglyphicos appellant, nemo discebat, nisi circumciscus. Omnis hierophantes, omnis vates, omnis cœli, infernique mystet et conscius, apud eos ipse non creditur nisi circumciscus."—Origines ad Rom. Ep. c. ii, § xiii, from Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, § clxxxv.

sayer or prophet, unless he were first circumcised. Epiphanius² speaks of circumcision as peculiar to hierophants and priests; and Horapollon³ gives as a reason why the Cynocephalus stands for a priest "that he is born circumcised, and that the Egyptian priests sedulously observe circumcision." On the whole then, we may conclude with Josephus, that circumcision as an Egyptian rite was obligatory on all who belonged to the priest class, or who desired to be initiated in certain mysteries; but that many of the people, as the testimony of Herodotus goes to prove, submitted to it, as with it were associated ideas of extraordinary purity and holiness.

Of the other people who practised circumcision we know little. We are told merely that they circumcised. From the expressions used by Herodotus, the Phenicians, we would suppose, circumcised their children while yet infants—but whether circumcision was among them a religious or a national rite, or a fashion merely as Herodotus would give us to understand, we have no means of ascertaining. One thing we know, that their colonies, as Carthage for instance, seem early to have dropped the custom—and they themselves observed it so loosely, that there is some doubt as to whether it obtained among them. The Arabians, we have positive evidence, circumcised in the time of Josephus,⁴ and then as now adduced as the reason of the rite, the example of their ancestor Ismael, in imitation of whom also they did then and do still circumcise at the age of thirteen. They moreover impose the operation, as do also the Ethiopians, on both boys and girls.⁵

Now of the ancient nations we have mentioned, who

² Spenser, p. 54-59: "Asserere videtur Epiphanius (Hæres 30) circumcisionem solis Ægyptiorum Hierophantis et sacrorum ministris peculiarem."

³ Hieroglyph. xxv.....ὅτι αὐτοῖς γεννᾶται περιτετμημένος, ἣν καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐπιτηδεύουσι περιτομήν.

⁴ Antiq. lib. i, c. xii, § ii; and

compare Vita Josephi, § xxiii. The modern Egyptians (Arabs of the Bedawee tribe) never circumcise children till their seventh year, and often not before their fourteenth.—Lane's Modern Egyptians, vol. i.

⁵ Ersch und Gruber's Encyclopedie. art. *Bescheidung*, vol. ix, p. 268.

practised circumcision, the Israelites Edomites and Arabs appear to have derived the custom from their common ancestor Abraham; the Phenicians from the commands of their god and king Chronus; and the Egyptians and Ethiopians to have observed it from all ages. A question, therefore, has arisen as to the people with whom it originated. And because the Phenicians have by common consent been excluded from the field, and the claims of the Jews and the Egyptians have been alone considered, to the separate claims of the Jews and Egyptians we also will confine our attention. And

I. All the profane writers who speak of circumcision and of the various people among whom it obtained, speak of it as an Egyptian rite. Thus Herodotus⁶ says that circumcision was practised by no nation, except such as had learned it from the Egyptians. Diodorus Siculus⁷ estimates the Colchians and Jews to be Egyptian colonies, because they circumcise. Strabo,⁸ alluding to circumcision as an Egyptian custom, allows that it is practised by the Jews also, but that they were originally Egyptians. And lastly Jamblichus, quoted by Stanley,⁹ says of Pythagoras, that “when at Sidon he conferred with the prophets and with the Phenician priests, and was initiated into the mysteries and sacred institutions of divers other parts of Syria,”—he did this “not being ignorant that the rites of these places were deduced from Egyptian ceremonies.” But

II. To this Egyptian origin Jews and Christians have objected. It is not probable they have argued, that, at the age of ninety and nine, Abraham, out of mere caprice and in imitation of the Egyptians, should have consented

⁶ Lib. ii, § xxxvi: Τα αἰδοία ὦλλοι μὲν εἰσι ὡς ἐγένοντο, πλὴν ὅσοι ἀπο τούτων (Αἰγυπτίων) ἐμαθόν.

⁷ Chap. i, part i, § xxviii: Ὅι δὲ οὖν Αἰγυπτιοὶ φασὶ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀποικίας πλείστας ἐξ Αἰγύπτου καταπάσαν διασπαρῆναι τὴν οἰκουμένην. . . . Λέγουσι δὲ το, τε, των Κολχῶν ἔθνος ἐν τῇ Ποντῇ καὶ το των Ἰουδαίων ἀνα μέσον Αραβίας καὶ Συρίας,

ὀκίσαι τινὰς ὀρμηθέντας παρ' ἐαυτῶν, διὸ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς γενεαῖς τούτοις ἐκ παλαιοῦ παραδεδοσθαι το περιτεμνεῖν τοὺς γεννωμένους παῖδας, ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετενηνεγμένου το νομίνου.

⁸ From Michaelis, ut supra.

⁹ Stanley, History of Ancient Philosophers, Pythagoras, Part ix. chap. iii. p. 349.

to undergo the painful and dangerous operation of circumcision;¹ he could have been induced to it, only by the positive command of the Deity. The rite therefore was probably, as the books represent it, ordained by God himself. But if ordained by God himself—is it credible they ask that the Deity, who desired to perpetuate the remembrance of a particular covenant entered into with Abraham alone, should for that purpose have preferred as its token, a mark which was already imprinted on the body of every Egyptian priest? No—the conjecture is absurd, and much more probable is it that the Egyptians circumcised in imitation of the Jews.

Again: we are bid to observe, that the Greek testimony which has been adduced must lose much of its authority, when we remember that it proceeds from men, who, because they regarded the Egyptians as the fathers of Greek civilization and knew of the Jews only by report, very naturally therefore and without any the least previous inquiry attributed to the Egyptians the origin of all those customs which they found common both to them and to the Jews. Besides, who are the writers who give this honour to the Egyptians? Herodotus who lived 445 B. C. Diodorus

¹ "Circumcisionis actio ita comparata est, ut nemo vel sibi vel liberis suis, nisi propter fidem et religionem, eam sit factururus. Nam non est levis aliqua cruris læsio sed res durissima et difficillima, nec sine vitæ discrimine quandoque subeunda." — From Maimonides, Spenser, *De Legibus Heb.* lib. i, c. xiv; and see also from Lightfoot, *ut supra*.

² Witsius, lib. iii, cap. vi. Witsius besides closes his case in favour of the Hebrew claims to the origin of circumcision, by an argument of Pierius Valerianus, drawn from Exodus. For when Pharaoh's daughter finds the child Moses enclosed in the basket, what is her exclamation? "This is one of the Hebrew's children!" And how, he

asks, could the child's nation have been so instantly ascertained, had not the child borne upon him the seal of his parentage, circumcision? To say nothing of the persecutions which were then directed against them, we may answer: that it is not improbable that the Hebrews swaddled their children differently from the Egyptians; — that it is quite certain that the Egyptians (*μελαγχρωες και ουλοτριχες*) were, and, on the walls of Thebes and Luxor, are still, by their features and complexion, distinguishable from the Hebrews; — and that lastly the child could scarcely have been Egyptian, because the Egyptians we are assured never exposed their children. (*Vide Diodorus Siculus, lib. i, c. lxxx*).

and Strabo, cotemporaries, *the one of Julius, the other of Tiberius, Cæsar*; and Jamblichus, who, though Pythagoras of whom he wrote the life lived a century before Herodotus, himself belonged to the later periods of Grecian literature :—and can we put the authority of these men in comparison with that of Moses who died almost a thousand years before the first of these was born ?

To the claims of the Jews and

i. As they rest on Scripture, we may object :

1st. That the early sacred books, though they mention its introduction into the city of Shechem, no where speak of circumcision as a custom of Hebrew origin, nor of it as copied from the Hebrews by the Egyptians.

2dly. That the very terms in which it is first ordained prove, that it was a custom known and practised in the days of Abraham, and that it was a custom with which Abraham was himself acquainted.

3dly. That the words in Joshua, already quoted, “ This day have I rolled the reproach of Egypt from you,” imply that in Egypt, in the time of Moses uncircumcision was a dishonour, an evidence of low caste.³

ii. As they impugn the authority of those Greek writers who have given us an account of Egypt, we may observe

1st. That though these writers are certainly centuries younger than Moses, their statements nevertheless wonderfully tally with his. They show us in the Egyptians the same pride, the same abhorrence of strangers, the same superstitious faith, and the same love of the mystic and magic arts ; they seem to fill up a picture of which Moses has but given us the outlines. The very discrepancies between him and them are but so many varied lights which “ morning, noon, or dewy eve ” shed over the same landscape. Their accounts confirm, and are confirmed by, those of Moses.

2dly. That though in their statements of the Jewish

³ Vide also Exodus vi. 12.

opinions with respect to circumcision, these writers have shown but little acquaintance with the Jewish mind :⁴ that nevertheless their statements at least prove that in Egypt circumcision was so sedulously practised, and considered of such vital importance, and its origin so lost in the night of ages, that the mere observance of this rite by any other people was for the Greeks sufficient evidence either of an Egyptian ancestry, or at least of some long intercourse with Egypt.

III. As they are based on probabilities, we may remark

1st. That it is just as probable that the Deity, in token of his covenant with Abraham, should choose a rite already known, as one which would be copied, and afterwards claimed, by other nations.

2dly. That though to assert, that Abraham would not have undergone circumcision but at the express command of the Deity, appears reasonable enough; yet when we remember that in our day many among the Hindus yearly throw themselves under the car of Juggernaut; and that among the ancient people, the priests of Rhea^s suffered a mutilation the most horrible in honour of their goddess; we cannot but feel that "the command of God" in one age and one state of civilization may intend something very different from what it does in another.

But let us now examine how circumcision could have been plagiarized by one people from the other, and let us suppose it to have been borrowed,

I. By the Egyptians from the Jews: then—

As after the ordinance of circumcision: Abraham does not seem to have visited Egypt, nor indeed any of his descendants till Joseph, and afterwards his father and brethren,

⁴ Vide Witsius, ut supra.

⁵ "Seneca apud S. Augustinum, sic ritus insanos perstringit ministrorum ethnicorum: ille viriles partes sibi amputat, ille lacertos secattantus est perturbatæ mentis et scdibus suis pulsæ furor..... Refert etiam Lucianus sacrorum

ministros quos Gallos vocant, in Rhæ honorem se castrare solitos; quosdam insuper adolescentes, ad templum Deæ Syriæ se conferentes, ense dstricto partes ipsorum genitales executisse."—Spencer de Leg. Heb. p. 555, and see Juvenal, Sat. ii. 116; and vi. 513.

settled there:—from Joseph or his family the Egyptians must, if they copied it at all, have copied this rite. But Jacob and his sons were unclean⁶ in the eyes of the Egyptians: the Egyptians had a moral and religious antipathy to them, and one which centuries of intercourse appear no way to have diminished, for Moses speaks of himself as of one whom Pharaoh would despise as profane.⁷ But from nations or individuals who are profane, “an abomination,” one surely is not in the habit of borrowing institutions; and yet this must have been the case with the Egyptians, if we suppose that they acquired this rite from the Hebrews.

But Joseph, the favourite of the Pharaohs, filled high posts of honour in Egypt. He had moreover married into a family of high priestly caste; and through him that caste may have gained a knowledge of, and borrowed, the rite of circumcision. What then was circumcision for Joseph? It was a rite which did not in itself confer any superior purity,⁸ but merely confirmed and preserved an already existing purity of race; a family rite, which could advantage only a particular family, and that but in so far as this family continued stedfast in the worship of its family God; a religious family rite, which was a token as the bow in the cloud of the Elohim’s favour,—not however of the Elohim’s favour to mankind, but of His favour to Abraham and his descendants alone,—and a token given to assure them, and them only, that they should one day inherit and possess the land of Canaan. If asked then the meaning of this sign (and surely the Egyptians would have asked its meaning before they imposed it on themselves), what in Joseph’s answer could induce them to adopt and appropriate it? i. e. induce them, the priest-class of a great

⁶ “The Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews, for that is an abomination to the Egyptians.”—Gen. xliii. 32.

⁷ “And Moses spake unto the Lord, Behold, the children of Israel have not hearkened unto me; how then shall Pharaoh hear me, who am

of uncircumcised lip?”—Exod. vi. 12.

⁸ Is not the slaughter of the men of Shechem, (Gen. xxxiv) after they had submitted to circumcision, an evidence that, in these early times, circumcision alone conferred nothing?

nation, to confound themselves with the children of a petty tribe? *We* might do such things; *we* have arrived at that pitch of civilisation, that we are glad to learn even from barbarians; but who that keeps before him the spirit of the ancient people, especially the Egyptians, will believe it of *them*, and of *their proudest class*?

II. By the Jews from the Egyptians.

Before his circumcision Abraham had visited Egypt. He had been struck no doubt by the power and wisdom⁹ of its priests; and in the solitude of the desert he meditated often on their doctrines, their institutions, and the mystic rites of initiation. He remembered too that he was himself a priest of the Most High God, and that he was to become the father of a priest nation; and that the land of Canaan was that nation's promised inheritance: and he then asked himself, whether he should hesitate to make a sacrifice, which in Egypt was obligatory on all who were vowed to the priestly office? whether he should be less holy than these ministers of vain idols, less devoted to his God, less willing to suffer for his God's honour?¹ How infant man, who regards *not the reasonableness* of any religious act *but his own motives*, would answer these questions we cannot a moment doubt; and we may conclude, therefore, that the circumcision of Abraham after his visit to Egypt (supposing that the Egyptian priests already observed this rite), was both natural and probable.

But if the Hebrews circumcised in imitation of the Egyptians, it will be asked, why *the one people only partially*, and *the other universally*, observed this rite? and

⁹ In Hyde, (de Rel. Vet. Pers. 70, 75) from Josephus, Eusebius, &c. is a long account of Abraham, who, it seems, civilized the Egyptians, and taught the Egyptians and Phenicians astronomy. If there were any foundation for all this, my argument would fall to the ground. It is, however, the invention of later writers. Vide supra, p. 266.

¹ It may be objected to me that I have here presumed motives, which are not to be found in the record.

In stating the claims of the Jews, we must keep to that account of the institution of this rite which the Jewish books have handed down to us. But in stating those of the Egyptians, we ask only, what would be the natural course of things?—what are the motives which induce *one people* to adopt the customs of *another*, even though, while they adopt them, these people may put forward original reasons for their institution.

why *this* performed the operation on infants, and *that* on men, or on those who had at least arrived at the age of puberty? In Egypt circumcision was a step preparatory to initiation into the mysteries; it was a step therefore which every man who took must take voluntarily, of his own free will, but one which, to deter the many from taking it, was attended with certain inconveniences, a certain suffering. Among the Jews, on the other hand, it was a symbol of the nation, which, as descended from Abraham, claimed to be "a holy nation," a "nation of priests;"² and it was therefore a symbol which, as a Jew, every man must wear; and to ensure his wearing it, it was fastened on him at his birth. Among *the one people*, while it was the sign of a spiritual brotherhood, it was also an evidence of the zeal, the docility, and patience of the suffering Neophyte; and *among the other*, while it was but the mark of a common parentage, it was also both a service attached to their possession of Canaan, and a gage of their common God's continued favour and protection.

We will now examine the different reasons which induced some of these nations to the practice of this rite. Among the Phenicians, it seems to have been at its origin a penance, a sacrifice offered to propitiate an angry deity; and so long as it obtained among them, it was probably looked upon as something onerous,³ as a pain voluntarily inflicted by the father on his child, or the man on himself, to pacify the envy of Gods jealous of human prosperity and happiness. Among the Egyptian priests, in whose eyes cleanliness, or cleanliness perhaps as conducive to health, was a matter of no little religious importance;⁴ and who, therefore, shaved their heads, and suffered no hair upon their bodies, and indeed rid themselves of every thing which seemed to them superfluous, and which served but to accumulate filth,—this rite probably originated in that

² These expressions have clearly, it seems to me, allusion to the Egyptian customs.

³ Vide supra, p. 355. I may also observe here, that from the cruel

character of the national superstition, I should suppose that the Mexican circumcision had the same object in view as the Phenician.

⁴ Vide Herod. ii, 37, 63, 77, 81.

anxiety after bodily purity which characterises the religions of tropical climates. Among the Jews it obtained, because it was supposed to have been imposed upon them by their God, and it was after a time regarded by them as a rite which conferred on those on whom it was performed a peculiar holiness. As however it had been merely commanded by God, and He had not deigned to give any reason for its institution; and as it appeared to uncircumcised people an absurd and ridiculous ceremony;⁵ later Jewish writers endeavoured to show its advantages and reasonableness. Thus, Philo-Judæus gives for its use four principal reasons, which he professes to have heard from tradition.⁶ Of these reasons, the first was, that circumcision prevents a certain disease, *αἰσθαξ*;⁷ the second, that it is favourable to cleanliness;¹⁰ the third, that it gives *την προς καρδιαν ὁμοιοτητα του περιμηθεντος μεροισ*;⁸ and the fourth, that it is favourable to generation.⁹

*10 The Greeks and
Jews derived it from
reasons of health
& cleanliness,
which seem to
be explained by
Gibbon in the
Recherches de l'Éti-
mologie & l'usage
des mots, &c.
vol. ii. p. 195. De
la Faculté de l'Éti-
mologie, p. 578. Note.*

⁵ Thus Calvin (Witsius, p. 224) looking through Geneva spectacles of the sixteenth century, finds circumcision a rite absurd and ridiculous in itself, and one which the command of God could alone sanctify. On this opinion of Calvin's, I must again observe:

1st. That Calvin, like most of the Protestant divines, evidently regards God's commands as *merely arbitrary*, i. e. such that they might just as reasonably have been the opposite of what they are. And

2ndly. That I cannot join in the mock of the uncircumcised, though I see no good reason for circumcision; for I cannot believe that a rite which has maintained itself among the same people, and in the same climates, for thousands of years, can be altogether unreasonable.

⁶ *Ἀρχαιολεγομενα παρα θεσπε-
σις ανδρασιν, οι τα Μωσως ου
περιεργως διηρμηνευειν.*—De Cir-
cumcis.

⁷ "Westing, an eminent physi-
cian, is of opinion that there were
natural reasons for the Egyptians,

both men and women, receiving cir-
cumcision."—Calmet, art. *Circum-
cision*. Had this, however, been
the fact, circumcision had been uni-
versally observed, whereas, accord-
ing to all probability, it was only
partially so. This matter is thor-
oughly investigated in Michaelis,
Mos. Recht. at *supra*; and ear-
nestly on the other side by De
Pauw, *Recherches sur les Améri-
cains*, part iv, chap. iv.

⁸ Lightfoot gives a reason as
whimsical as this one. "The land
of Canaan," he says, "was be-
queathed to Shem by his father
Noah, because Ham and his son
Canaan had derided Noah's naked-
ness. When therefore the land
was to be settled on the right heirs
of Shem, a seal and an assurance
thereof is given on that member
which had been derided by Canaan,
to the loss of that land. This is a
main reason why males alone were
circumcised, and why on that mem-
ber."—From Middleton's Works,
vol. ii. p. 195.

⁹ This last reason reminds me of
a German rationalist's explanation

Of circumcision as a rite actually observed by these several nations, we may observe, that the Phenician was induced to submit to it only by motives of fear: on him it conferred no special honour or purity; it did not raise him above the people with whom he trafficked; and as soon therefore as he perceived that it could be omitted with impunity, he ceased to impose it upon his children; and it gradually fell into disuse. With the Jew and the Egyptian, on the other hand, it was a religious ceremony, and the seal of the child's or the man's dedication to God; it introduced him into the circle of the Deity's more immediate favourites; it made him holier and purer than his fellow-men; and he consequently looked down upon them, and perhaps avoided their society.¹

With the Jews however circumcision seems to have held higher place than with the Egyptians. It grew in importance as the Jewish mind and character developed itself. The want of it was visited with scorn; and the term which expresses that want was in the lips of the Hebrew prophets a bitter reproach, and the strongest epithet by which they could express both their hate for, and the unholiness and impurity of, their enemies. And such was the sanctity which this rite was supposed to confer, that in the later periods of the Hebrew republic, even Christianised Jews would not admit their heathen Christian brethren to equal rank and fellowship with themselves: "they that were of the circumcision contended with Peter, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them." It was in fact for the Jews the great pledge of God's especial favour and protection, their national symbol, a religious and distinctive mark of honour, which both separated them from the rest of mankind, and sanctified that separation; and it consequently became more dear, and was the more insisted on, as their intercourse with other people became closer or more frequent.

of the birth of Isaac. It is in Eichhorn, *Bib. d. Bib. Lit.* to which as it is too strange for English ears I can only refer.

¹ John, xiii. 28; Acts x. 28; for natural causes which induced in the Egyptians a hate of strangers, see Robertson's *India*, b. i. § i.

With the Egyptians on the other hand, circumcision never seems to have acquired any exclusive importance. Like the Jews indeed we find them obstinate in their hate of, and avoiding any close intimacy with, foreigners,—but not because those foreigners were uncircumcised. For,

1st. It is pretty clear that not all Egyptians were circumcised.

2ndly. Though circumcision is spoken of as a requisite for all who would be initiated into the sacred mysteries or who aspired to the honours of the priesthood, yet it is nowhere spoken of as the only requisite. Pythagoras must not merely be circumcised. They who converse with the priests must do so : *αγνευσάντας, καὶ πολλῶν ἀποσχομένους καὶ τοῦτο ὥσπερ κοινὸς τῶν κατ' Ἀιγύπτου ἱέρων δεσμός ἐστιν.*²

And 3rdly. Though non-circumcision is certainly alluded to in Joshua as a reproach in Egypt, yet it is never stated by Moses, nor mentioned by Herodotus, as a reason for the Egyptian hatred of strangers. Had it been so, the circumcised would surely have been exempted from that hate ; and yet with the Hebrews, a circumcised race, the Egyptians might “not eat bread, for that is an abomination to the Egyptians.” (Genesis xlv. 32.) And again (xlv. 34), Joseph bids his father tell Pharaoh that his trade had been about cattle : “for every shepherd (circumcised or uncircumcised) is an abomination to the Egyptians.”³

Circumcision then among the Egyptians was one of many rites which distinguished the several grades of the priesthood : it was a *caste*, and *not a national*, symbol ; but, as a caste-symbol, its importance depended on the power or reputation of the caste to which it belonged, and with that caste consequently it seems to have fallen into contempt, as I think the reproach of Apion sufficiently testifies.

² Clemens, from Marsham ?

³ From these verses, and Herodotus, lib. ii. c. 41 and 65,—and compare De Pauw, *Recherches sur les Américains*, vol. ii, Pt. iv, § iv, p. 120,—we may pretty nearly as-

certain the cause of the Egyptian avoidance of strangers, and that without having recourse to the nomadic hordes of Tyschsen. Vide Ueber d. Buchstaben d. alt. Ægypt. Bib. d. alt. Lit. und Kunst, vol. vi.

"Him that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised."...But "thy bondmen and thy bondwomen which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen which are round about you."⁴ Circumcision then was obligatory on the *slave*, but left to the choice of the *stranger*; and yet *this man* it made a citizen of Israel, while *that* it left what it found him—a slave. Wherefore then was it a solemn and advantageous rite for *the one*, and only a painful operation for *the other*? The stranger was free to depart to his own country, wherever he would; he was considered but a visitor in, or a traveller through, the land; and all that could be asked of him was to obey during his sojourn the police laws of the state. The slave, on the other hand, was an inhabitant of Canaan, bound to its soil: as he belonged to the country, he must be subject to its customs;⁵ and as he belonged to his master, he belonged to his master's God,⁶ and with his master must wear that God's seal. But besides, circumcision was not a mere cruelty inflicted upon the helpless slave: it gave him many and great advantages; it saved him from the stigma of uncleanness; it enabled him to partake in all the great national feasts; it occasionally gave him a seat at his master's table; it made him a member of his master's family. Imposed on his children, and his children's children, it became for them an ancestral rite; it nationalised them, and gradually opened to their view the prospect of liberty and citizenship: it gave therefore the freedom of the family; and was not this a step towards the freedom of the state?⁷

⁴ Leviticus xxv. 44.

⁵ See *supra*, p. 278, with note ².

⁶ Vide *supra*, p. 176, notes ⁶ ⁷.

⁷ The haughty Brahmins receive strangers into their holy caste by binding on them the triple cord.—Vide Dubois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. i, p. 127. Manco Capac adopted the chiefs of his kingdom into the family of the sun, by giving them the title of Ynca. (*Hist. des Incas*, liv. i, chap. xxiii.) Lacedemon occasionally gave freedom to its helots, *e. g.* to those who volunteered to

serve under Brasidas. (Thucydides, lib. v. c. 34.) And in Rome, slaves were often emancipated by their master, and their children became citizens. (Michelet, *Hist. Rom.* lib. iii, chap. i.) Was it in the Mosaic code alone that no provision was made for the liberation of foreign slaves? or do not the laws in Deut. xxiii. refer to them, and determine the period at which, according to their nation, they were to be on the same footing as the hired servants of the Israelites?

Slavery is a thing odious in our eyes. It is opposed to our views of right and justice, and to all our social institutions; its existence among us would be an anomaly and a crime, which could but embarrass our onward progress in civilisation. But was slavery always thus? If we look back into past times, or indeed extend our view beyond the mere pale of European society, we find that there is a period in the life of Humanity when it is regarded, and that as well by the slave^s as the master, as quite in accord with the supposed laws of God and the then recognised rights of man. And it may therefore become a question whether at this period slavery is not in reality, as it is then considered, the great promoter of civilisation, and the condition without which all advance, all improvement is impossible? And this question we must not too rashly solve. We must weigh well the wants and difficulties which beset infant man, the small choice of expedients which present themselves to his mind, and his apathy, and indolence, and ignorance. We must not forget that he is an isolated being; that nothing but absolute necessity will drive him either to labour for himself or to unite with his fellow men in labour for some common object. Or suppose him willing to labour, yet as his conceptions are undervalued or disregarded by those around him: he never can realize them, unless by right of parentage, or of conquest, or of purchase, he can command the assistance of others, *i. e.* unless he have slaves.

We must remember also that in these early times there

^s “ Dans l’Inde, l’état de domesticité n’a rien de dégradant par lui-même; le valet mange avec son maître, la servante avec sa maîtresse; et les uns et les autres vont de pairs dans le commerce de la vie. *Les Européens tenant à cet égard une conduite toute différente, leur service est à cause de cela devenu odieux pour tout indigène qui conserve quelque amour propre, ou quelque sentiment de délicatesse; et*

l’on ne doit pas être surpris de voir auprès d’eux que la lie de la société.”—Dubois, Indes, vol. i, p. 57. This is said of servants, but is applicable to slaves, the only servants of early ages. It gives us insight into the differences between the service of our and of other times. Amongst our German ancestors also: “ Dans la famille germanique, la domesticité ennoblit,” &c.—Michelet, Hist. de France, vol. i, p. 275.

was only a distinction of ranks, and not a difference of conditions;⁹ that the slave in general, undistinguishable in complexion and features from his master's children, held in the house the same place as a son; in his labours his master shared, and he was not forgotten in his master's feasts. The master was the father of his slaves, the father the master of his children; the slave and the child walked hand in hand, with this only difference, that the child became in time himself a father and a master, while the slave remained ever a child.

The master too whose power was protected by no penal statutes or civic regulations, depended for its continuance on the force of habit, and on the esteem and affection with which he knew how to inspire his family. He had his duties and they were the safeguard of his rights. If of

⁹ See the preceding note; also the description of Laertes and his slaves, *Odys.* xi, and compare xxiv; also Plutarch's account of the kindness and humanity with which slaves were treated in the early times—*Life of Coriolanus*, &c.

¹ Negroes, however, appear as slaves in the Egyptian paintings.—Vide Wilkinson's *Egyptians*. I am not sure but that their differences of complexion, &c. are not an insuperable bar to any true equality between the European and the negro races. I speak of them as making part of the same nation. For, in the same nation can there be equality between two races which cannot, or at least should not, intermarry one with the other?—between two races, of which the inferior one is physically offensive to the superior? We cannot, however, yet answer these questions, for we do not know what change education and civilisation may produce in the constitution and brutalized features of the negro.

² Cuvier is of opinion (*Règne Animal*, vol. i, p. 47) that these great civilisers of mankind—to whose

times history does not in reality extend, but of whom Abraham may fairly be considered a type—sought to make of their superior knowledge a means of domination over their fellows. Now I believe that some domination existed, *perhaps* before any superior knowledge was attainable, and *certainly* before it could be directed to any great practical results; and that the knowledge of these men modified that domination, made of it a blessing. And in corroboration of my view, I would point to the castes of India and Egypt (*Laws of Menu*, passim; *Creuzer, Symbolik*, vol. i, p. 253; *Herder, Rel. u. Phil.* vol. iv, p. 231, *Ægypten*, chap. iv)—to the aristocratic monarchies of Greece (*Wachsmuth, Antiq.* vol. i, p. 114)—and to the rights of the patricians in Rome, (*Michelet, Rome*, 1st period);—to the institutions, in a word, of the most ancient nations; and I would ask whether these institutions did not naturally grow out of the then existing state of society?—whether they were not suited to the then state of popular feeling?—and whether they were

meditative mind, he occupied himself with, and worked out, the principles of justice and morality and religion: he was then a priest and prophet. If of an observant character, he searched into the secrets of external nature, he found there herbs fit for food or medicine; or he discovered metals and applied them to use; or he invented tools for more easily cultivating the earth, or for dressing skins, or carding and weaving wool and cotton; or he observed the stars and the sun's course and the moon's changes, and then calendarised the times and seasons. Or if his intellect was practical rather than inventive, he sat at the gate of his tent and listened to the wants, or settled the disputes, of his servants: or he taught them and their children those axioms of religion and morality which he had received from his fathers. He was the depository of the learning, the history and the customs of his race; and if he laboured not with his own hand, his was the head which directed to profit the labour of others. He alone knew where to sow and when to reap,³ and he alone could call down upon his family the blessing of their God. Without him his servants must perish.

“Money.” “On n’a pas trouvé,” observes De Pauw,⁴ “dans toute l’Amérique un seul peuple qui eût inventé une monnaie.” And yet already in the time of Abraham we have a known and current standard of value; something, which, whether it consisted of mere rude ingots valued

not then regarded as benefits so great, so essential to the well-being of society, that all accorded in wishing them perpetual?

³ On earth, all things, even the best, grow corrupt. As the knowledge necessary to practical life filtered down to the common people, the priests and learned classes, anxious to preserve their power and authority, had recourse to the terrors of superstition. With the division of years into seasons, there was another vulgar division into days,

lucky and unlucky. With the natural calendar then they joined a religious calendar, whose intricacies and variations were beyond the reach of the profane.—Vide De Pauw, *Egyptiens*, vol. ii, p. 186; *Hyde de Rel. Pers.* chap. xvii, p. 206; *Pallas’ account of the astrological books of the Calmucks*, *Reise*, vol. i, p. 353; of the Chinese calendar, *id.* vol. iii, p. 158; and *Adams’ Roman Antiquities*, p. 268.

⁴ *Américains*, vol. ii, pt. v, p. 184.

according to their weight,⁵ or of different pieces of metal bearing a particular shape, as the gold and silver rings which formed the money of Egypt in the fifteenth century⁶ B. C., was a recognised means of exchange.

Verses 15, 16. Sarai's name is changed to Sarah, "princess;" and the blessings which Jehovah had confined to Abraham, are by the Elohim extended to Sarah also. She it is who shall be the mother of nations, and kings of people shall be of her.

Verse 17. The Elohim is the Creator of the universe, and the great Providence which rules the world. He it is who drove our first parents from Eden, who destroyed mankind at the deluge, and scattered them over the face of the earth at Babel. All these his works were known to Abraham—for with Abraham he was wont to talk as with a friend; and to Abraham he has just revealed the infinitude of his power and the moral nature of his service. And yet now that he proceeds to repeat those promises which Jehovah yesterday made, and yesterday confirmed by a sign—how are those promises received? The awed Abraham falls upon his face; his attitude is all attention and respect and reverence, but in his heart he laughs sceptically; he doubts and disbelieves; he understands how God may create or destroy a world, but not how Sarah "that is ninety years old shall bear?" His conduct here is then in contradiction with his creed—but not unnaturally so.⁷ Of infant man our childhood is in some measure a type. And those years we can surely remember, when though on our lips God was the Creator and Almighty, in our hearts

⁵ Genesis xliv. 21.

⁶ Wilkinson's Thebes, money of Thotmes, 1495 B.C.

⁷ Thus the people whom Mohammed addressed seem not have been unwilling to acknowledge a Creator; but they say: "After we have become bones and dust, shall we be raised a new creature?"—

Koran, chap. xvii; and Sale, in a note to chap. xvi, tells us of "a professed disputer against the resurrection," that he "came with a rotten bone to Mohammed, and asked him whether it was possible for God to restore it to life."—So also the resurrection was a stumbling-block at Athens.

we doubted not but that we could hide from him our thoughts, and deceive him by some external homage. Similarly Abraham—he has a *speculative*, rather than a *practical*, faith in the Deity. He has glimpses, indeed, though few and far between, of God's power. He acknowledges it in the courses of nature, he sees it exercised in those thousand accidents for which he cannot account; but whatever in his eyes bears the character of inalterability seems to him without its province.

But again, the ancestors of Abraham had all lived their two, three, and four centuries; his own father died at the advanced age of two hundred and five, and had, according to some commentators,⁸ already counted one hundred and fifty years when Abraham was born; and we nevertheless here find this very Abraham—who after the death of Sarah *i. e.* when he was at least one hundred and forty, took to himself wives and begat children,—though he has now only just past the meridian of life,⁹ sceptically inquiring “Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? And shall Sarah that is ninety years old bear?” Surely under the circumstances these questions are impossible—unless indeed we suppose: that the laws which regulate human life in our day altogether differ from those which regulated it in the patriarchal times: that then, between the duration of life and the power to perform all its functions there was not *as now* any relation, but that, like him of the eastern tale whose body was turned to stone, these age-wearied men retained of life only the capacity of suffering—a supposition which seems to me untenable: and the doubt of Abraham therefore, is in my eyes altogether irreconcilable with that state of mankind which this book records.

⁸ Vide Russell's Sacred and Profane History. It seems to me, at any rate, that the question of Abraham in this verse, is quite incompatible with this conjecture.

⁹ Supposing Abraham lived, or expected to live, only so long as the shortest lived of his ancestors,

Nahor—and, by the age which he actually reached, he must have had every reason to expect this—in his hundredth year, supposing life to have extended to one hundred and forty, he was as a man in his fifty-seventh year in our day, when life is limited to eighty.

Verse 18. "Oh that Ishmael might live before thee!" Is this the strong cry of love? Did Abraham so love this son, was he so wrapped up in that love, that he was jealous and fearful lest some new object should claim a share in his affection, or press Ishmael from his heart? Or do not these words rather express the hidden doubt? Are they not a remonstrance which a disbelief that dares not openly avow itself timidly ventures, a suggestion by which the servant hopes to gain the ear of his master? The answers of the Elohim, though he showers blessings upon Ishmael, seems to imply this.

Verse 20. The blessing pronounced upon Ishmael must have been already realized when the book of Genesis was written or compiled; for in its twenty-fifth chapter we find the names of the sons of Ishmael, "by their towns, and by their castles, twelve princes according to their nations."

Verses 22-27. God leaves Abraham. And Abraham then performs his part of the covenant and circumcises all the men of his house.

In the first verse of this chapter Jehovah is represented as identifying himself with the Elohim, and as in chapter xvi. he bore the title of Adonai, so here he claims to be Elohim Schaddai.

The remainder of this chapter is written with the name Elohim. It contains the account of a promise which the Elohim gave to Abraham and which in substance is the same as that recorded of Jehovah in chapter xii, and again repeated in chapters xiii and xiv.

If now we compare this chapter with that portion of Genesis of which it forms a part, we find, that, here first the Elohim author ventures on the etymologies of names. In this chapter we have the etymologies of the names of Abraham and Sarah, and the origin of the name of Isaac, "Laughter."

If we compare its promise

i. With that which the Elohim gave to Noah; we observe that *they both* take the form of a covenant, and that *they are both* connected with the imposition of new laws; with this difference, that *the one covenant* is represented as conditional on the observance of those laws, while *the other* is wholly unconnected with them.

And ii. With those promises made by Jehovah:¹ we find

1st. That the Elohim always expressly appears, while Jehovah sometimes seems, in so far at least as the text affirms, only to have addressed his favourites.

2ndly. That the Elohim opens his promise to Abraham by a solemn declaration of his name and title, while Jehovah (save in ch. xv) at once proceeds to make known His intentions.

3rdly. That, as the ground or condition of the promises made, *the Elohim* holds up the rite of circumcision (xvii, 9, 10); Jehovah, on the other hand, the faith of Abraham. (xv, 6.)

And 4thly. That the Elohim's form of expression is short and simple, while Jehovah's is full of similitudes,—imaginative, poetical. Thus, to convey the notion of a numerous posterity, the Elohim promises to Abraham—“I will multiply *thee* exceedingly: thou shalt be the father of many nations: I will make *thee* exceeding fruitful; I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.” And in relation to Ishmael, He says—“I have blessed him and made *him* fruitful, and will multiply *him* exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget: and I will make him a great nation.” Jehovah expresses the same promises, with some variations of phrase. To Abraham he declares—“I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that

¹ This comparison is of course very imperfect, as it includes only a portion of the promises made by either Jehovah or Elohim. It will however assist us, and that too very materially, in forming our judgment, when the whole of them are before us.

bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and on thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.”...“ And I will make *thy seed* as the dust of the earth”...“ and look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them—so shall *thy seed* be.” And to Hagar He promises—“ I will multiply *thy seed* exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude.” *The one*, makes *the man* exceeding fruitful and multiplies him, and he becomes the father of many nations; *the other*, multiplies *the man's seed*, till it is as the dust of the earth or the stars of heaven—for multitude innumerable. *The former* blesses by simply giving posterity, and seems to know no higher blessing than a powerful posterity;² *the latter* blesses by assurances of love and favour: His love He labours to express: He heaps blessing on blessing: through Abraham He seems to become reconciled to man, and through Abraham He blesses all mankind.

Again, as regards the promised land, the Elohim either gives the land of Canaan by name, or speaks of it as “*the land wherein thou art a stranger* ;”³ while Jehovah gives “*this land*,” or bids Abraham “look northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward,” for all that land shall be his; or, while He gives it, He marks out its boundaries and geographical position, it is the land “from the river of Egypt unto the great river Euphrates.” The gift of the Elohim then supposes merely, that at some time or other Abraham had visited Canaan and that the country was not altogether unknown to him; but the gift itself may have been made in China, or on the banks of the Euphrates, as well as in Canaan: it wants locality, and the substance of it only is preserved to us. The narrative of Jehovah, on the other hand, has all the reality which local colouring can give it. You ascend the mountain with Abraham; with him you walk through the land; and with him you

² As in the blessing of Abraham, xvii, 6: “Kings shall come out of thee;” and in that of Ishmael, 20: “Twelve princes shall he beget;” and compare with this last the blessing by Jehovah, xvi, 10.

³ The marginal reading has, “Of thy sojournings.”

measure its bounds: you know all the circumstances which called forth the several deeds of gift, and you hear the very words in which the gift was made.⁴

With this chapter we may connect,

i. Chapters i and ix, in so far as they represent the Elohim as the great law-giver. But, as the ninth chapter represented the Elohim promulgating certain laws which bear with them no mark of necessity: so this chapter shows Him either instituting or authorising a religious ceremony which an advanced state of civilisation has rejected as burdensome and absurd; and yet we have these laws and this ceremony ordained by the same authority which in the first chapter gave their several laws to Nature and Humanity.

ii. The institution of circumcision, and the various observances connected with it, among the Hebrews.

iii. The belief of the Hebrews, that because their laws and religious ceremonies originally came from God, no change could take place in them but by the express command of the Deity.

iv. Their expectation that the God who had made this covenant with their fathers would continue His especial favour towards themselves, so long as they fulfilled their articles of the covenant.

And v. We may connect with the belief of the Israelites, that their laws, &c. were given them by their God, the similar belief of several other people:—of the Hindus and the Zend people; of the Cretans, who believed that Minos was *Διος μεγαλου σαριστης*,⁵ and that his laws were the revelation of Jupiter; of the Lacedemonians, that Lycurgus was the especial friend of the Delphian god, and his laws divine revelations, &c.

⁴ Vide T. F. W. Müller über die d. Biblisch. Literat. vol. iv, p. 480. Urkunden Genesis, Eichhorn, Bib. ⁵ Odyssey, xix, 179.

CHAPTER XVI.

GENESIS xviii. 1-33.

Verses 1-5. After a short preface which makes known the subject-matter of this chapter, we see Abraham sitting at his tent door—he is now very old, and he is basking in the full sunshine; his eyes are fixed on the ground; he meditates probably on the hopes and future fortunes of his race; when lo, three men stand by him—and the aged patriarch is young again; he runs to meet the strangers, he bows himself before him who seems the chief among them, he promises them the best his house affords, his servants¹ and even his wife are called upon to attend to their comfort, and he himself hastens forth to choose out from amid his herd the fatted calf. With his own hands he prepares for them the feast, with his own hands sets it before them, and stands by them under the tree while they do eat. And all this while he asks no questions, he intrudes not himself upon his guests, he is content to administer to their wants and to do them service; his hospitality has all the warmth of affection with all the reserve of the highest breeding.

The hospitality of Abraham we must not however prize

¹ In the accounts which Volney and Burckhardt give of the hospitality of the Arabs, I do not remember any mention of washing the feet. Roberts, in his *Oriental Illustrations of the Holy Scriptures*, however, informs us that in

India, to wash the feet and ankles of the weary traveller is considered a necessary part of Eastern hospitality. He adds, moreover, that the service is always performed by servants.—Vide ad hunc loc.; and see *Iust. Menu*, chap. iii, § 101.

too highly. He but exercises the virtue of the desert, and a virtue of which the meanest Bedouin even in this day often gives an example. Volney tells us of the Arabs, that “the principal Shaik in every tribe defrays the charges of all who arrive at or leave the camp.....Adjacent to his tent is a large pavilion for the reception of all strangers and passengers. The crowd which enters successively, he must treat with coffee, bread baked on the ashes, rice, and sometimes roasted kid or camel; and in a word he must keep open table; and it is of great importance to him to be generous, as this generosity is closely connected with matters of the highest consequence. On the exercise of this his credit and his power depend. The famished Arab ranks the hospitality which feeds him before every virtue.”² And of the people themselves, he informs us that³ “if a stranger, nay even an enemy, touch the tent of the Bedouin, from that instant his person becomes inviolable. It would be reckoned a disgraceful meanness, an indelible shame to satisfy even a just vengeance⁴ at the expense of hospitality. Has the Bedouin consented to *eat bread and salt* with his guest, nothing can induce him to betray him. The power of the Sultan himself would not be able to force a refugee from the protection of a tribe, but by its total extermination. What little the Bedouin pos-

² Volney's Travels in Syria and Egypt, chap. xxiii, § iii; and for the consideration hospitality obtains, see also Burckhardt's Notes on the Bedouins, vol. i, pp. 72-118.

³ Ut supra. This hospitality has however its limits; “after the stranger has dwelt in the tent of his host three days and four hours, he is expected to state his business; and if he remain there, to take a share in the family labours.”—Vide Burckhardt, ut supra, p. 179.

⁴ To feel the full force of this generosity, we must know the full force of this desire of vengeance in the Arab. Volney, ut supra, tells us: “So nice are the Arabs on this

point of honour, that if any one neglect to seek his retaliation, he is disgraced for ever. He therefore watches every opportunity of revenge; if his enemy perish from any other cause, still he is not satisfied, and his vengeance is directed against the nearest relations. These animosities are transmitted from father to children, and never cease but by the extinction of one of the families, unless they agree to sacrifice the criminal, or purchase the blood for a stated price in money or in flocks.” And consult also Burckhardt, ut supra. On the Blood-revenge, or Thar, vol. i, p. 148, and again, id. p. 312.

sesses he is ever ready to divide. He has even the delicacy not to wait till it is asked; when he takes his repast he affects to seat himself at the door of his tent in order to invite passengers! his generosity is so sincere, that he does not look upon it as a merit but merely as a duty: and he therefore readily takes the same liberty with others."⁵ The same frank and generous spirit is to be found among the North American Indians. "Quiconque," says Lafitau, "entre chez eux est bien reçu. A peine celui qui arrive, ou qui rend visite, est-il entré, qu'on met à manger devant lui, *sans rien dire*; et lui-même mange sans façon, avant d'ouvrir la bouche pour déclarer le sujet qui l'amène."⁶ And so also the ancient Germans⁷ held it a crime to refuse hospitality to and to share their food with the stranger. In short *among all uncivilised, or half-civilised, nations of noble race*, hospitality is not so much a virtue as the want of it a crime. *Among us, the civilised,*

"Whoe'er has travelled life's dull round,
Whate'er his stages may have been,
Must sigh to think he still has found
The readiest welcome at an inn."

Yes, hospitality has become among us one of those cheap virtues which men are content with loudly extolling,—a sort of mythic virtue, which may very prettily adorn a ballad or a pastoral, but which not one man in his senses would ever think of exercising. Have we then degenerated—do we shrink from duties which our forest ancestors embraced so warmly, and held ever so near to their hearts? I do not think so hardly of our age, nor so hardly of civilisation.

⁵ Lafitau, *Mœurs des Sauvages*, vol. ii, p. 83.

⁶ *Quemcumque mortalium arce tecto, nefas habetur, pro fortuna quisque apparatis epulis excipit. Cum defecere, qui modo hospes fuerat, monstrator hospitii et comes, proximam domum non invitati adeunt. Notum ignotumque,*

quantum ad jus hospitii, nemo discernit..... Gaudent muneribus: sed nec data imputant, nec acceptis obligantur."—Tacitus, *Germania*, § xxi. What an insight do these few last words give us into a whole code of morality, and one based on very different principles to ours!

1st. Circumstances have changed, and the moral of circumstances has changed with them. The innumerable commercial relations of civilised Europe, the strangers who throng its towns, and the accommodations which money may every where purchase, have rendered an indiscriminate hospitality neither desirable nor necessary. The inn, become now the home of the traveller, has relieved society of a tax which had become impossible.

And 2ndly. Another state of society has introduced another view of moral obligation. When strength lost its rights and power its privileges, generosity, which is the root and fount of all their virtues, ceased to be our principle of conduct. The noble classes, in all that constituted nobility in the eyes of the olden world, together with the society of which they were the very life and energy, have perished. Every where an equal law is now paramount; every where the rights of man, no empty phrase, are felt, and practically acknowledged. Inclination no longer determines duty. The sense of equality has developed in us the sense of justice. To do justice is the rule of our lives, the highest aim of our moral endeavours. Either we dare not be generous, or we are generous because we are just. In other words, morality has taken the place of impulse; duty of sentiment, and a higher state of society has succeeded to a lower; and man, though he cannot now boast the easy graces of the indebted and grasping prodigal, walks at least with the firm step, and wears the elevated front of honest independence.

Verses 4-7. In these primitive times occupation was no disgrace. Homer shows us Andromache feeding the horses⁷ of Hector, and Nausicaa washing the clothes of her brothers and her kingly father Alcinous;⁸ and Herodotus,⁹ in that tale which he relates of the first founder of

⁷ Iliad viii, 186.

⁸ Odyssey vi, 9, &c.

⁹ Lib. viii, § cxxxvii. And Bosman thus describes a negro prince: "Un prince qui arrive à l'âge de

travail choisit quelque profession honnête, telle que l'agriculture ou la pêche. Il en tire de quoi four nir à son entretien. Il n'a pas honte de porter le fruit de son tra-

the Temenian race, speaks of the then king of Macedon as cultivating his own field, and of his wife as cooking the victuals for him and his hinds; and Volney¹ describes a modern Bedouin Sheikh as one who, though "he has the command of five hundred horse, does not disdain to saddle and bridle his own, nor to give him his barley and chopped straw: in his tent his wife makes the coffee, kneads the dough, and superintends the dressing of the victuals; his daughters and kinswomen wash the linen, and go with pitchers on their heads and veils over their faces to draw water from the fountain."

Verses 6-7. Volney² again informs us that in Syria, "Every house has its portable mill with which the women grind the barley or the Dourra for their sustenance"—but he adds—"the flour from these mills is coarse, and the little round loaves made of it ill-leavened and badly baked, but they preserve life and that is all that is required." Burckhardt³ says of the Turkomans: "Their bread is a thin unleavened cake, which the women bake upon a hot iron plate in less than a minute;"—and of the Bedouins: "The Ayesh (flour and sour camel's milk made into a cake and boiled) is the daily dish of the Aenezes; and even the richest Sheikh would think it a shame to order his wife to dress any other dish merely to please his own palate. The Arabs never indulge in luxuries, but on occasion of some festival or on the arrival of a stranger. For a common guest, bread is baked and served up with the ayesh: if the guest be of some consideration, coffee is

vail au marché. Le reste de ses occupations ne répond pas mieux à sa naissance, et c'est ordinairement de ces exercices mécaniques qu'il monte au trône royale de ses pères." — *Histoire Générale des Voyages*, vol. iv, p. 184.

¹ *Travels in Syria and Egypt*, c. xxiii, § iii.

² *Id. ib.* vol. ii, c. xxxix, p. 288.

³ *Vide Travels in Syria*, p. 638. Somewhat similar seems to be the

bread of some of the North American Indians: "C'est une masse de leur farine, pestrie mal proprement sans levain et sans sel. Ils l'enveloppent de feuilles de bled d'Inde, et le font cuire sous la cendre, ou le font bouillir dans la chaudière..... Ce pain n'est pas de conserve, et n'est guère bon qu'à être mangé chaud en sortant du four."—Lafitau, *Mœurs des Sauvages*, vol. ii, p. 94.

prepared for him, and *behatta*, or bread with melted butter. For a man of rank a kid or lamb is killed. When this occurs, they boil the lamb with burgoul and camel's milk, and serve it up in a large wooden dish, round the edge of which the meat is placed."⁴

Verse 9. I cannot better exemplify the text than by again referring to the customs of the desert. Of the Turkoman women Burckhardt observes, that "they do not hide themselves even before strangers; but the girls seldom enter the men's rooms, although permitted to talk freely with their father's guests."⁵ In another place he describes the conduct of some Arab women whom he accidentally fell in with: "Ayd (his guide) knew the women, who belonged to his own tribe; their husbands were fishermen, and were then at the sea shore. They brought us some milk and were not at all bashful. I freely talked and laughed with them, *but they remained at several yards distance from me.* Ayd shook them by the hand, and kissed the children; but Hamd, who did not know them, kept at the same distance as myself."⁶ And again he says—(and I see Sarah behind the tent door, and I remember Abraham's visit to the country of the Pharaohs)—"In one encampment I found the women much more reserved than among other Bedouins. I could not induce any of them to converse with me, and soon perceived that both themselves and their husbands disliked their being noticed:—a fastidiousness of manners for which they were no doubt indebted to the frequent visits of their husbands to the capital of Egypt."⁷

Verses 9, 10. "And they said, where is Sarah thy wife? ... and he said, I will certainly return unto thee," &c. Abraham receives and converses with his guests, like Hagar, unconscious of their high dignity, till the allusion

⁴ Notes on the Bedouins, vol. i, p. 62.

⁵ Syria, p. 638.

⁶ Id. ib. p. 421; and Nubia, p. 139.

⁷ Syria, p. 539; but see Sophocles, *Ced. Colon.* 353.

made by one of them to the near fulfilment of his long delayed hopes reveals to him Jehovah.⁸ And if it be objected, that in this case Abraham, besides that he seems to address himself to one only of the strangers, treats his guests with unnecessary and unheard-of deference,—for he bows himself to the ground before them, and waits upon them like a servant while they eat:—we will observe, that he addresses one only of the strangers, because that one is evidently the lord or chief of the others; and that he bows himself before him, as he bows himself before the sons⁹ of Heth,—as according to oriental custom all bow themselves who demand a favour.¹ We may add too, that *before this promise or prophecy*, the three guests are always either spoken of together and anonymously, as “rest yourselves,” “set the meat before them,” and “they said;” while, *after it*, we have but one interlocutor, and that one mentioned by name—“the Lord said, Jehovah;” I conclude therefore that the objection is of little weight.

Verses 11-15. Sarah doubts Jehovah’s power to alter or control the course of nature; but Sarah knows and feels Jehovah’s power over her own fate and fortunes. Hence, *on the one side*, her mockery of Jehovah’s idle promises, her heart-laughter at His impossible boasts; and, *on the other*, her fear of His anger, and her stout denial of an act which He might regard as an insult. Her conduct is that of a cunning slave before a capricious master.

Verses 17, 18. May not these verses, prefacing Jehovah’s intentions towards Sodom, assist us to the sense

⁸ Patrick, Comment. ad hunc loc. seems to think that Abraham knew Jehovah at once, that Jehovah appeared in his glory. The commentary on this chapter—however I speak from memory—is so confused and contradictory that it is some-

what difficult clearly to make out what he means.

⁹ Vide chap. xxiii. 7.

¹ Vide Burckhardt’s account of the eager and ambitious hospitality of the Bedouin.—Notes on the Bedouins.

which Moses probably attached to the great promise made to Abraham, that in Abraham all the families of the earth should be blessed? For, we *here* learn, that "the Lord will do unto Abraham as He hath spoken of him;" because "Abraham will command his children," &c. . . . "and they shall keep the way of the Lord."² But, *from the subsequent dialogue*, we know that ten righteous men would have saved Sodom.³ Is it not then pretty evident that, in the belief of Moses, the world was preserved from dissolution only by the moral life of those few of its inhabitants who worshipped the true God? But those few were the Israelites, the seed of Abraham. Were not these few then indeed *a blessing* to this earth? its salt, as the gospel expresses it? and perhaps at every moment of time its salvation.⁴

Verses 19-33. According to Hesiod,⁵ heaven rains down plagues on those states and assemblies that are regardless of the right; while those which observe the laws of justice Jupiter preserves from the horrors of war and famine, and loads with favours. Often, he exclaims, is a whole city

² In the Chinese books this truth is more broadly and fully stated: "Ce n'est pas" (says his minister to Tai-kia, an emperor of the Chang dynasty, 1753-1529 B.C.), "ce n'est pas que le Ciel ait un amour particulier pour la dynastie de Chang. Le Ciel aime une vertu pure."—De Guignes, Chou-king, Pt. iii, c. vi, p. 102.

³ Thus Lot's piety is strong to save (had they taken the warning) his sons and his sons-in-law, and his daughters, and whatsoever he had in the city: (chap. xix. 12.) compare, however, Ezekiel xviii. And the Jews even to this day believe that "God will not redeem them for any merit of theirs, but for his name's sake, *and for the sake of the few righteous*."—Adams' Hist. of the Jews, p. 488.

⁴ The Koran (chap. ii, p. 45) si-

milarly tells us that "if God had not prevented men, the one by the other, verily the earth had been corrupted." The Hindu books hold up the Brahmin as him "through the benevolence of whom other mortals enjoy life."—Menu, c. i, § 101, and c. viii, § 22. And in the Zendavesta, Ormuzd declares to Zoroaster "s'il n'y avoit pas comme vous quelqu'un qui exécutât ma parole, qui fût pur dans ses pensées, dans ses paroles, le monde seroit maintenant à sa fin."—Ha xlix, p. 194. This belief is however a necessary corollary of the Zend view of the creation and of the power of Ahri-man over it. In Genesis it has no necessary connexion with the great first view of the Deity and the world; it is a thought suggested by a belief in man's demoralization.

⁵ Εργα και ήμεραι.—215-55.

the victim of the pernicious counsels, and the disorders of a single citizen,—and the people die, the women are afflicted with barrenness, and families perish away. In the Etruscan fragment already quoted,⁶ Jupiter is represented as himself punishing those who remove their neighbours' landmarks, and are false and double-tongued. Their names and families are threatened with extermination; for their crimes the very earth is afflicted with storms, and its productions suffer from rains and hail, and parching heat and blights; and dissensions arise among the people. The Chinese books make the weather a barometer of moral excellence: "Quand la vertu règne, la pluie vient à propos... une chaleur qui vient à propos désigne la prudence... Quand les vices règnent, il pleut sans cesse; et les vents soufflent toujours si on est aveugle sur soi-même."⁷ In China, the good or evil which heaven accords to men depends on their moral state.⁸ The Hindu law regards all disease⁹ as the punishment of past offences; and the Zendavesta¹ refuses to all who neglect its oft-

⁶ "Cum autem Jupiter terram Heturiæ sibi vindicavit, constituit jussitque metiri campos, signarique agros; sciens hominum avaritiam vel terrenam cupidinem, terminis omnia scita voluit.....Sed qui contigerit moveritque possessionem promovendo suam, alterius minuendo, ob hoc scelus damnabitur a Diis. Si servi faciant, dominis mutabuntur a deterius. Sed si conscientia domestica fiet, celerius domus extirpabitur, gensque ejus omnis interiet. Motores autem pessimis morbis et vulneribus afficientur, membrisque suis debilitabuntur. Tum etiam terra a tempestatibus vel turbinibus plerumque movebitur. Fructus sæpe lædentur decutienturque imbribus atque grandine, caniculis interient, robigine occidentur, multæ dissensiones in populo fient. Hæc sistote cum talia scelera committantur: propterea neque fallax, neque bilin-

guis sis, disciplinam pone in corde tuo."—From Michelet I have transcribed the whole of this passage, it gives one so large an insight into the Etruscan superstition.

⁷ Chou-king, part iv, c. iv, p. 172; and compare Deut. xi. 13.

⁸ "Le bonheur et la malheur," says Y-Yu, "ne sont point attachés aux hommes; mais le bien ou le mal que le Ciel envoie dépend de leur vertu."—Id. p. 182.

⁹ Institutes of Menu, c. xi, p. 48, where may be found the particular disease which is attached to each particular crime; and Von Bohlen, *das Alt. Indien*, vol. i, p. 37.

¹ "Comment vivra-t-on longtemps, deviendra-t-on grand, sage, intelligent? ne viendra-t-il pas de l'intelligence de la loi, O Ormuzd!" (Ha xxx.) And of those who perform not the requisite ceremonies, "S'ils demandent des biens, s'ils désireront que des troupeaux nombreux,

enjoined ceremonies the wealth, and strength, and numerous herds, which it heaps on its punctual votaries.

All these creeds acknowledge, we find,

I. A great general Providence, which rules the world according to certain appointed laws; and

II. An especial Providence, which orders physical accidents according to man's moral conduct.

But of the physical accidents themselves, which the Deities in these different creeds are supposed to employ in their moral government of the world, we may observe, that there are two kinds:

1st. They are such as immediately affect the individual himself, and affect him alone, or at the most his family with him; as poverty, disease, &c. as in the Zend and Hindu creeds. And

2ndly. They are such as immediately affect, not the individual, but the world about him, and the individual through it. Such are the pestilences, storms, and unseasonable weather of the Greek, Etruscan, and Chinese creeds.

Considered as punishments, the first kind have the advantage of being strictly just,—they fall directly on the criminal, and “every man then suffers for his own sin.” *The second*, on the other hand, while they evidence all the force of that bond which undeniably unites man to man, and gives to the whole of society an interest in the conduct and character of each one of its members, are liable to objection, because they equally afflict the innocent and the guilty; because in short they are unjust.²

As regards the Jewish faith, from this colloquy it

et dont les corps soient grands, leur soient donnés, ou qu'ils souhaitent intérieurement que la force leur soit donnée, *vous ne la leur accorderez pas.*—Zendavesta, Ha xlv. vol. ii. p. 193.

² I know no better explanation of their injustice than Voltaire has given us in *Candide*. When the Dutch captain who had robbed

Candide perishes with his ships, *Candide* exclaims to *Martin*, “*Vous voyez que le crime est puni quelquefois; ce coquin de patron Hollandais a eu le sort qu'il méritait.*” “*Oui,*” dit *Martin*, “*mais fallait-il que les passagers qui étaient sur son vaisseau périssent aussi.*” Dieu a puni ce fripon, le diable a noyé les autres.”

would seem, that its views of providence differ in nothing from those contained in these other creeds. Its God rules the world by precisely the same laws, and shows His pleasure or displeasure in exactly the same way. We must observe however that when, *like the Deities of the Greeks, Chinese, &c.*, He is about to punish by accidents which will affect men in the mass, he, *unlike them*, takes care by some direct interposition in favour of the innocent to render these accidents pernicious only to the guilty; He is not therefore liable to the charge of injustice. But as every extraordinary event is *now* a manifestation of some sentence which God pronounces on the conduct of those whom that event affects,—sudden poverty, some diseases, &c., become evidences of hidden crimes, and men are then judged rather by their fortunes than by themselves,—their circumstances are the test of their worth.

But does the Deity indeed govern the world as these creeds represent Him to have governed it? Or rather—for into the great mysteries of Providence none have penetrated, and the dark problem of life none have yet solved—does the little light experience and observation have lent us verify the views which infant man seems almost universally to have taken of the Divine Providence. And

1. As regards states. Do the people die, and are the women afflicted with barrenness, because of the pernicious counsels or the disorders of a single citizen?³ Who that considers the degraded state of Spain since the reign of Philip II, or calls to mind the fatal consequences to India of the infamous rice monopoly in 1770,⁴ will refuse his

³ Vide from Hesiod supra; the *Œdipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles, &c. Thus too in the Jewish books we find the women of Gerar afflicted with barrenness, because Abimelech seized on Sarah; and the eldest born of the Egyptians struck by the hand of death, because Pharaoh detains Israel; and from the prayers put up in our churches on

the occasion of the first madness of George the Third, we learn that the sovereign was deprived of reason in punishment of our iniquities. —Wraxall's *Memoirs*, iii, 324.

⁴ "The rice monopoly in 1770, caused the death through hunger of not less than 5,000,000 of Hindus."—Dow, *History of Hindostan*, vol. ii, p. 101.

assent to the great general proposition, that the mistakes of the governors are prejudicial, and often fearfully so to the governed. But this general proposition it is not which these creeds assert. In the eyes of their authors, its natural consequences were no sufficient punishment for error. They indeed heeded not the evils which all error, whether moral or intellectual, necessarily produces. God therefore must sanction His laws, as we do ours, by punishments that have no natural connexion with the acts to which they are attached. Hence a scheme of Divine Providence, of which we know but this:—that every national crime is as certainly the prelude to some great national calamity, as every national calamity⁵ is the consequence of some foregone national crime, i. e. a scheme of Providence which, as its manifestations are conceived and realized by the imagination alone, no reason can test, and no experience verify, and which but rests on authority, and through our hopes and fears commands our belief.

II. As regards individuals. Is disease indeed the punishment of sin? and are wealth and other temporal goods the rewards of piety and virtue? as the Parsees, Hindus, &c. believe.

And 1st. As regards punishments. That very many diseases may be traced to excess, *sometimes* in sensual pleasure, *at others*, of mental and physical exertion; and again, that of these diseases, some are transmitted by the man to his posterity, are facts now universally acknowledged. And because they are facts which depend on some one of those great laws that rule the material universe, i. e. because they take place by God's will, and according to God's law,—though I may not

⁵ In Du Halde's China, (vol. iii, p. 41) is an edict issued by one of the Chinese emperors, Yong-tching, on occasion of some epidemic which was then raging. The emperor has looked into his own heart, and has examined into the lives and conduct of his family, to find whether the sin for which his people

are suffering is in himself or his house. He bids his people follow his example: for until the sin is expiated and put away, they cannot expect the plague to cease. Does not this exemplify the cry of Abimelech, "Lord, wilt thou also slay all a righteous nation?"

understand *how*, from my very soul I believe, that they are consonant with the Divine justice. But these facts, into which no idea of punishment as a sanction of the moral law *can* enter, merely exemplify some portion of the natural law of cause and effect. It is not to them then that our creeds can refer. Their doctrine is—that the laws of the material universe, in so far as they affect the corporeal man, are modified in particular cases to meet individual wickedness, or are made subservient to the punishment of individuals.⁶ Thus Miriam becomes leprous because she conspires against Moses; and Uriah is struck dead because he touches the ark of the Lord: i. e. they assert that diseases, misfortunes, are but dooms pronounced on our moral state, involuntary penances for sins of which we may be wholly unconscious: i. e. they assert a providence, of which the terrible but clumsy proceedings of the Inquisition are a copy.

2ndly. As regards rewards. “Un jour, au cercle,” tells us Tallemant des Réaux, “je ne sais quel homme fit à Malherbe un grand éloge de Madame la Marquise de Guercheville, qui étoit alors présente, comme dame d’honneur de la Reine-mère, et après lui avoir conté toute sa vie, et comme elle avoit résistée aux poursuites amoureuses du feu roi, Henry IV, il conclut son panégyrique par ce mot, en la lui montrant, ‘Voilà, monsieur, ce qu’a fait la vertu.’ Malherbe sans hésiter lui montra la Connetable de Lesdiguières,⁷ qui

⁶ A modification of this opinion is cherished by our modern religionists. “Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth,” is now their motto. And not health, not riches, not temporal blessings, but misfortunes, real or imaginary, deserved or accidental, are the favours on which they dwell. Are they ridiculed for their long prayers in the marketplace, for their zeal in small matters, for their impertinent assumption,—or are they opposed for their loud bigotry and their sectarian intolerance,—instead of looking into themselves to correct their most

hideous faults, they only the more sedulously admire their own excellences, exclaiming, “Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth.”

⁷ I ought to explain, that for her virtuous resistance to Henry IV, Madame de Guercheville, a lady of high nobility, had been made dame d’honneur to the queen; and that Madame de Lesdiguières, who was a woman of low birth, and originally the mistress of the celebrated Maréchal de Lesdiguières—had smoothed the way to a marriage with him by poisoning her husband.

étoit assise auprès de la reine, et lui dit, ‘Voilà, monsieur, ce qu’a fait le vice.’”! For every Pamela in real life we may find at least one Nell Gwynne. We may remember too that Socrates died in prison, and Christ on the cross; Sylla the first man in Rome, and Alexander Borgia loaded with years and the head of the Christian Church.

But to keep to every-day men and every-day occurrences. Let us take Hogarth’s two parish prentices. *They* have about the same common average talent; *the one* however is industrious, gentle and modest in his carriage, fair and punctual in his dealings, and to a decent observance of the common precepts of morality he joins great respect for men in authority, and opinions in repute. *The other*, on the contrary is idle, overbearing, and overreaching; he is as indifferent to the feelings of those around him, as to his own fair fame; he is a scoffer and a debauchee. Cannot we now very probably predict the fortunes of these youths? *The one* will succeed in life, will acquire wealth, and be loved and respected; *the other* will meet with nothing but disappointment and misfortune, and will, unless he gain a great prize in some lottery, almost certainly die a beggar—if he do not die on the gallows. Is not virtue then rewarded on earth? I think not. *The honest prentice*, like Cardinal de Retz,⁸ may wear his character from motives of policy: he has met with the rewards of prudence, merely because he was prudent, and not because

⁸ Guicciardini, I know, makes the Pope die of the poison he had prepared for his friends. Voltaire, however, in an essay on the death of Henry IV, has shown the improbability of the story.—Essais sur les Mœurs et l’Esprit des Nations, vol. i, pl. cxc.

⁹ See his Mémoires. “Je ne faisais pas le dévot, parceque je ne pouvois pas assurer que je puisse durer à la confrairie; mais j’estimois beaucoup les dévots, et à leur égard c’est un des plus grands points de la piété. J’accommodois même mes plaisirs au reste de la

pratique.”—vol. i, p. 29. And again: “Je n’ignorai pas de quelle nécessité est la règle des mœurs à un évêque.....et je sentoie en même tems que je n’en étois pas capable.....Je pris après six jours de reflexion le parti de faire le mal par dessein.....parcequ’en le faisant ainsi, l’on y mêt toujours des préalables qui en couvrent une partie, et parcequ’on évite par ce moyen le plus dangereux ridicule qui se puisse rencontrer dans notre profession, qui est celui de mêler à contre-tems le péché dans la dévotion.”—Id. p. 50.

he was virtuous;—and his idle companion similarly has been ruined, not by his vices, but by his imprudence in vice.

Has God then thrown us on this earth without a single inducement to piety and virtue? The question is,—what do we call inducements to piety and virtue? Are you ambitious?—do you intensely desire wealth, honour, &c.? God has said: “You may be gratified: only be industrious to acquire, prudent to keep what you have acquired: observe men and events, and be wise to judge of opportunities, and active to seize on them, and you will most probably attain your ends.” But perhaps you desire temporal goods with moderation, you would be a good man as well as a rich one. Well, God has so ordered it, that the practical wisdom which leads to fortune is no way incompatible with the purest and most religious virtue. But moreover God has so ordered it, that accident, chance, will sometimes do more for a man than the wisest conduct; that *at others* it will elude all foresight, baffle all endeavour. Do what we will, the murrain kills our cattle, the blight destroys our corn, the moth eats up our treasures, the thief breaks in and steals. Our providence is of no avail. And *now*, we turn about to seek whether there be not blessings which once possessed are inviolable, and to study how to acquire them. Those blessings we have found in that pure Virtue whose seat is the bosom of God. With religious faith man has called her down to earth. The light and spirit of holiness now fill his heart, and bear him up with a calm joy in the midst of misfortunes and disappointments, and give him a foretaste of that beatitude which awaits him when sin and death shall have no more power over his body, and his will shall be no more feeble, nor his soul faint.

We may observe here that the days of Adam, after the curse of death was on him, were nine hundred and thirty years; that about the same number of years elapsed from the time Noah pronounces the curse upon Canaan, to that

in which it is realized upon his descendants; and about half that number from the same period to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

This chapter is written with the name Jehovah. And

i. As in the Jehovah narrative of the deluge, it describes the determinations of Jehovah with regard to Abraham and his descendants, as thoughts which Jehovah makes known in soliloquy with himself. (Compare v. 17, 18, 19, with vi. 6, 7, viii. 21, 22.)

ii. As in chap. xii. 7, it makes Jehovah to appear.

iii. As in the Jehovah genealogies, &c., it gives us an insight into the civilization of the period of which it treats. The three men travelling unprotected, the generous and polite hospitality with which they are received, the comfort evidently attached to cleanliness, the fine meal, the calf dressed with butter and milk, are all indications of a state of society advanced beyond that of barbarism.

iv. As in the fourth chapter, it shows us Jehovah as the great judge of mankind, and it makes Him, as in the eleventh chapter, to come down from heaven to execute His judgments.

v. It gives to Jehovah, and for the last time, that kind and confidential tone which He was wont to use in His dealings with the antediluvian men.

vi. As in the twelfth chapter, in Abraham it blesses the whole earth.

As compared with the last, an Elohim chapter—and Eichhorn supposes that it refers to the same event—we find

i. That there are some points of resemblance between them. Both refer the name of Isaac to the incredulous smile of one of the parents of the promised child; and both determine the exact period of the child's birth. *According to one*, "Sarah shall bear a son at this set time next year;" *according to the other*, "At the time appointed will I return to thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son."

ii. There are also great points of difference. The Elohim with the promise of the child associates a certain rite,

circumcision ; and Jehovah, the long and tried faith of Abraham : on the observance of circumcision, *the former* makes the possession of Canaan conditional,—on the faith of Abraham continued in his posterity, *the latter*. *This* then could scarcely attribute the smile of incredulity to Abraham, nor *that* under the circumstances give it to Sarah.

We may observe, that in this chapter the Deity is for the first time *named* the judge of all the earth.

With the nineteenth verse we may connect as a commentary upon it the seventy-eighth Psalm.

With the pleading of Abraham for Sodom and Gomorrah we may connect the prayer of Moses for the congregation in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. (Numbers xvi).

CHAPTER XVII.

GENESIS xix.—1-27.

Verses 1-11. This is a horrible tale, and more like an Eastern fiction than an historical fact. The details are so disgusting, that I willingly hurry away from them. I will but note a difficulty which presents itself to my mind. As one of the objects of the tale is to illustrate by an example the wickedness of Sodom, I naturally conclude that the conduct it attributes to the Sodomians was not the effect of some sudden and unaccountable frenzy, but something habitual; and I cannot help asking, how Lot could voluntarily fix his residence among, and afterwards contract family alliances with, so lawless and so vicious a people? and how it was, that knowing their character, he did not rather warn away the strangers from the dangers of the loathsome city, than press upon them his hospitality?

Verses 12-13. The strangers, having warned Lot of the destruction prepared for Sodom, desire him to gather his family together, and hurry away from the devoted land. He goes forth to call his children: his sons-in-law however refuse to accompany him. They look on him as little better than a madman or a dreamer. They chide him that, for so idle a message, he has awakened them out of their first sleep; they recommend him to return to his home; they laugh at his fears; "Ah, could we but hope to live as long as Sodom shall stand, the eternal city!" they cry; and they rub their eyes and go yawning to their beds,

and sleep their last sleep. On the morrow, they and Sodom are no more.

The doubts of his sons-in-law seem to have had some effect on Lot, for when the moment of escape arrives, he lingers; and the men—elsewhere called angels, clearly they wore human shape, and were no way distinguishable from other men—are obliged to lay hold of his hand and to bring him forth.

In the seventeenth verse a new interlocutor appears on the scene,—the Lord¹ himself; and he seems to have been immediately recognized, for Lot addresses him as God,—as having power to save and to destroy; and He answers as if possessing that power, for He remits the destruction of Zoar. And this Lord nevertheless speaks of himself as having only a limited power, “For *I cannot do anything until thou be come thither.*”

Verse 20. I know not why it is, but to God men pray as they would to their fellows. The smallness of the favour asked is, they think, a reason for its being granted. So in Sophocles, Ajax prays to Jove:

Αιτησομαι δε σ' ὄν μακρον γερὰς λαβεῖν.²

Verses 24-25. Volney, from the aspect of this part of Syria, “suspects that the whole valley [this one of Sodom] has been formed only by a violent sinking of a country which in some former period poured the Jordan into the Mediterranean.” He goes on however to say that “it seems certain that the catastrophe of the five cities destroyed by fire must have been occasioned by the eruption of a volcano then burning.”³ Michaelis,⁴ notwithstanding the brimstone rain, is of opinion that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by the sudden giving way of the crust of

¹ And yet this Lord, the one who was with Lot, in the 24th verse, rains brimstone from “the Lord, out of heaven.” Unless this be some Hebrew idiom, one would suppose the Lord raining and the

Lord in heaven were different personages.

² Ajax, 836.

³ Syria and Egypt, chap. xx, sect. iv.

⁴ Comment. ad hunc loc.

earth on which they were built, and which alone separated them from a subterraneous lake of liquid sulphur. And that this is no improbable conjecture, we may learn from Mr. Darwin's description of the volcanic and bituminous country about Concepcion. "The extent of country," he says, "through which the subterranean forces were thus unequivocally displayed, measures seven hundred by four hundred geographical miles. From several considerations, which I have not space here to enter upon, and more especially from the intermediate points where liquefied matter was ejected, we can scarcely avoid the conclusion, however fearful it may be, that a vast lake of melted matter, of an area nearly doubling in extent that of the Black Sea, is spread out beneath a mere crust of solid land."⁵

But though Michaelis, and others with him, thus explain, and very satisfactorily it must be owned, the fearful catastrophe which destroyed these cities, I do not think that they therefore explain the opinion which our author or his time entertained with regard to it. For after they have translated the language of the old into that of the modern world,—after they have identified the very natural objects or events which in this myth wear so marvellous a form,—they seem to think that they have cleared the story of all its difficulties, and that Sodom and Gomorrah then perish as in after times Herculaneum and Pompeii. But we have only attentively to read this narrative, to feel that Moses wrote it to call our attention, not to the brimstone showers and the fire rain which destroyed these cities, but to the primary cause of their destruction. And that cause—and here for us is the real miracle, of which no explanation can get rid—he finds in the wickedness and irreligion of the inhabitants, and not in the volcanic and bituminous nature of the country. Had Sodom and Gomorrah only continued faithful to the laws of Nature or Jehovah, they might, according to the belief of Moses, have still slept secure over the sulphureous streams which boiled beneath them.

⁵ Voyages of the Adventure and Beagle, vol. iii, p. 380.

Again the very differences of language and expression which distinguish the age of Moses from our own, can arise only from our differences of view. Moses, following out his system, believed that Nature should like some staid matron move on her way with a calm and measured step. But he had witnessed her wild throes; he had heard her shrieking agony; he had seen her with mad riot tear to pieces and devour her own loved children; and trembling and bewildered he made of her a puppet of which some hidden master pulled the strings. And now with an audacious faith he tore aside the curtain which separated him from Nature's mysterious Lord; with Him he held converse; he learned His plans, and was made a sharer in His counsels. The whole rationale of the universe was laid before him. And the thunder then became this Being's voice, the lightning His arm, the storm His instrument of vengeance,⁶ and the volcano's falling cinders and burning lava, fire and brimstone which He rained down from heaven. With every natural accident Moses thus joined its supposed author and object. Afraid to look at, and through, nature, he turned himself to nature's God, and without any pains-taking study, he could now explain every thing, account for every thing; his imagination was ever ready to supply him with laws to order the world which his imagination had created.

⁶ So also among the Peruvians: "Ils appelloient le tonnerre, l'éclair, et la foudre, les exécuteurs de la justice du soleil.....S'il arrivoit qu'un logis ou autre lieu fût frappé de la foudre, ils l'avoient en si grande abomination, qu'ils en mueroient aussitôt les portes.....Si elle étoit tombée à la campagne, ils en marquoient l'endroit avec des bornes, afin que personne n'y mit le pied."—Hist. des Yncas, vol. i, p. 59. Among the Romans, "Lorsque la foudre avoit tombé sur un lieu, il prenoit le nom de *fulgarita* ou *obstita*; il devenait sacré, surtout si un homme y avoit été tué;

on l'environnait de barrières pour que personne ne pût en approcher et la souiller."—Michelet, Hist. Romaine, vol. i, p. 255, note. Among the Greeks, "Persons killed with lightning were thought hateful to the Gods, and were buried apart by themselves, lest the ashes of others should be polluted by them; and all places struck with thunder were avoided."—Potter, Antiq. of Greece, vol. ii, p. 172, and see the death of Capaneus in the Phœnis. of Eurip. 1196. So also the Hindus look on thunder as the arm of Sudra, and believe that no bolt falls from heaven but to strike some offender.

We are beings of another stamp. Time and observation have made us more cautious and more modest. We rush no more into the presence of the Deity. We have learned rather to look at Nature in the face. We have gradually unravelled some few of the laws by which she regulates her course; others we labour to discover. We are patient in our ignorance, only to be more certain in our knowledge; and our knowledge, little as it is, is the foundation of our faith. We now indeed boast of no inspiration; and we can no longer explain or account for every occurrence; but we have gathered up here and there a scattered leaf of the great oracles of God, and by its study we have learned to look on every thing contentedly. We cannot, in truth, as our ancestors of old, see the busy hand of a meddling Providence in every unexpected event: we do not pray and tremble for our personal safety in every storm, nor do we feel a punishment in every disease; but we apprehend God's presence in all times and in all place, and we read His will in the laws of our corporeal and moral and intellectual nature.

Verse 25. "It may be inferred," says the English editor of Calmet's⁷ Dictionary, "that Lot's wife, delaying her flight and too slowly quitting the scene of devastation, was surprised by a shower of bitumen or sulphur falling upon her and around her; amid which she stood erect, motionless, deprived of life, and formed the outer nucleus for a mass which gathered around her, and which becoming hard as it cooled, was well known as the monument of this unhappy woman."

"His wife looked back." It seems that to look back is in India considered unlucky, and so unlucky indeed, that the expression is commonly used to account for any sudden and unexpected misfortune. Thus, "he has looked back and the evil spirit has caught him."⁸—Is there any similar phrase in Hebrew? And if there be, did the phrase origi-

⁷ Scripture Illustrated, Expository Index to Bible, p. 29.

⁸ Roberts' Oriental Illustrations of the Scriptures, p. 22.

nate the tale? Or was the tale the origin of the phrase? Did Moses attach to the phrase this myth, and thus intermingle his religion with everything in common life?

Verse 29. From this verse it would seem as though it was for Abraham's sake that Lot was saved.

Verses 31-38. In these verses we have the origin of the Moabites and Ammonites, and they are it seems of kindred race with the Hebrews. The desire of children, a holy motive in all eastern climes, and no incitement of lust,⁹ seems to have induced the daughters of Lot to this incest, of which the Ammonite and the Moabite were the produce. They were, we may observe, cursed races; and though their hire of Balaam, and not their origin, is put forward as the reason for their exclusion till the tenth generation from the congregation of the Lord,¹ I have no doubt that that origin was a reproach or topic of abuse which national hatred took heed not to overlook.²

⁹ A merely animal desire nevertheless. "Wie die Krankheiten des Menschen, so sind auch seine sittlichen Verirrungen als Recidive in die niedere Thierheit zu betrachten, da jede Stufe in der Thierreiche als eine frühere Durchgangspunct, als ein überstandenes Lebensalter zu betrachten ist, und so ist denn jedes Laster die Rückkehr zu einer bestimmten thierischen Natur. In diesem Sinne bezeichnete der Sprachgebrauch der Römer ein *Hure* richtig als *Lupa*. Da aber der Mensch bei einem solchen Rückfalle immer tiefer sinkt als das Thier, dem er dann ähnelt, und welches von der Natur auf diese Stufe gestellt ist, so steht auch die eigentliche Hündin weit höher als ihre Nachahmerin. Denn erstere hat zwar auch keine Liebe zu bestimmten Individuen, aber sie will bei den Opfern, die sie der *Venus vulgivaga* bringt doch nicht

als Befruchtung, und ist diese erfolgt, so ist sie befriedigt: sie hat im Dienste der Natur gehandelt und einen wirklichen Zweck derselben erfüllt." Like the *eigentliche Hündin*, were the daughters of Lot. Vide Burdach *Physiologie*, b. ii, § 250.

¹ Vide Deut. xxiii.

² Though in Hebrew story Moab appears sometimes as entering into family alliances with Israel (vide Ruth), and at others as offering an asylum to oppressed and fugitive Israelites, (2 Sam. xxii.; Jeremiah xl. 11); yet is there little doubt but that the continued jealousies and wars between the two nations must have at length produced a national hate which, on the side of the Hebrews (unable to deny their relationship) showed itself in threatening prophecies against the Moabites, (Numb. xxi. xxiv.; Isaiah xlviii.; Ezekiel xxv.; Zepha. ii.) and in

With the Lord and angels in this and the preceding chapter, we may connect the belief

1st. Of the Egyptians, that in ancient times the Gods visited the earth in human shape:³

And 2dly. Of the Greeks, that they visited the habitations of men like "poor stranger pilgrims,"

"Observing as they passe stil, who they be
That piety love, and who impiety."⁴

With Jehovah's visit to Lot we may compare Jupiter's visit to Philemon and Baucis.⁵ In both legends the unknown Deities are treated with disrespect by, and meet with little charity from, mankind; and in both the family which receives and hospitably entertains the Gods, is alone exempted from the destruction to which its neighbours are condemned.

And with Jehovah visiting Sodom and Gomorrah because "their cry is great and their sin is grievous," we may compare Jupiter brought down to earth from high Olympus by the loud report of men's infamy,⁶ and visiting Lycaon. In both legends the Deity seems to find men worse than he expected to find them,—in both legends he is treated with scorn, and the rites of hospitality are violated in his person, and in both he inflicts on the offenders signal punishment.⁷

If now we compare this chapter with the preceding of which it is a continuation, we cannot but observe that the same angels, who so willingly partook of the hospitality of Abraham, now hesitate to enter the doors of Lot, for whose sake one would have supposed it was that they visited Sodom. Was it to look for the ten righteous that

mocks upon their origin; and on the side of the Moabites, in pride, haughtiness, and cruelty. (Isaiah xvi. 6; Zephaniah ii. 10.)

³ Diod. Sic. vol. i, § xii.

⁴ Odyssey, xvii, 485, Chapman's translation; and compare Hebrews xiii. 2.

⁵ Ovid's Metamor. viii.

⁶ Id. ib. i, 210, &c. "Contigerat nostras infamia temporis aures," &c. &c.

⁷ Distinctly so in the legend preserved by Ovid:

"Minor fuit ipsa infamia vero."
Only impliedly so in that of Moses.

they desired to abide in the street all night? Or had they resolved to include Lot in the common destruction? And, in the absence of their Lord, were they fearful of compromising themselves to his safety by becoming his guests? Or did they avoid his hospitality, because the guest of the individual was then, as among the Arabs^s of the present day, the guest of the whole city, and was therefore bound, as its guest, to respect the persons and property as well of its citizens as of his particular host's family? i. e. had the Sodomians behaved with common decency, would Lot's accepted hospitality, according to the views then taken of the relations between the guest and his host, have rendered the destruction of Sodom a crime?

This chapter from the first to the twenty-eighth verse inclusive is written with the name Jehovah, the remainder with the name Elohim.

They both, *the one* in detail, *the other* summarily, narrate the same event, the destruction of the cities of the plain. There is however as usual some little variation in their accounts. For, the preservation of Lot *the first* evidently attributes to Lot's own merits and hospitality; *the second* to the Elohim's love for Abraham: *this* too speaks of the city to which Lot fled as though it had borne the name of Zoar even in Lot's time, while *that* in accordance with its love for etymologies accounts for its name, and in a way which renders it very improbable that that name should have become general till after Lot's family had grown numerous and powerful.

With this chapter we may compare chapter xix of Judges. Between them there is a wonderful similarity. They record the same inhospitality, accompanied by the same brutal ferocity of character; and save that *the one* is graced by a supernatural machinery which is wanting to *the other*, they both present, notwithstanding the five centuries

* See Burckhardt's Notes on the and also his (Nubia?) p. 351; Bedouins, vol. i, p. 172, Chap. On and see Koran, vol. ii, chap. xi, robbery and theft; and On Dakheil; p. 26.

which separate them, the same customs and state of society. From them we gather, that the traveller carried with him food for himself and provender for his cattle, and, as the inn or caravansera was unknown to these times, trusted to the hospitality of the cities through which he passed for a lodging. And in general the first person he met with on entering a town invited him to his house, and insisted on providing for all his wants. Should no host however present himself, the stranger sat him down in the streets, and most probably displayed his provisions, and thus made known that he would be no burden or expense to the family which received him, and that he only wanted a lodging. This appeal was I should think rarely resorted to, and from the text of Judges, must very rarely have failed.

With the escape of Lot from Sodom we may connect the injunctions laid upon the Hebrews with regard to the Canaanites. They were sent forth utterly to destroy the population of a certain country. They were the avengers of God; like the brimstone and fire mere instruments in His hand. Compassion⁹ must not touch their hearts, nor avarice induce them to mercy. To kill was their religious duty. But when beauteous maidens knelt before them, and innocent babes smiled on the destroyers, would not moved humanity exclaim, "far be it from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked." The soldier then must feel that God's judgments are altogether just, that the very convulsions of nature distinguished the innocent from the guilty; that thus the deluge respected Noah, the volcano Lot; that for the faithful some Zoar was ever near. And then with an assured conscience he could strike and spare not; an accursed race fell before him; in him mercy would be a crime: the children of God's enemies were wicked by fault of birth.

⁹ Thus Jeremiah, in his prophecy against Moab, exclaims, "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully, and *cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood.*"—xlvi. 10.

With the escape of Lot and his children from Sodom, we may connect the reported escape of the Christians from Jerusalem, on Titus's advancing to lay siege to it.

With the drunkenness of Lot we may compare the drunkenness of Noah. In both cases it seems to have been involuntary, and in both cases to have induced the man to acts of which he was unconscious and had reason to be ashamed.

With the quick and sudden vengeance with which the Elohim and the gods of Greece in the first ages visit crime, we may contrast the patience, and long-suffering, and slowness to anger, which both he and they display in after times.¹

¹ Θεοι γαρ εν μεν, οψε δ'εισορῶς, ὅταν
τα θεία φεις τις, εις το μαινεσθαι τραπη.

Sophoc. Colon. 1533, 4.

So also in the sneer of Juvenal:—

“ Ut sit magna, tamen certe lenta ira Deorum est.”

Sat. xiii, 100.

CHAPTER XVIII.

GENESIS xx. 1-18.

Verses 1-8. Sarah is the Ninon de l'Enclos of the patriarchal age. "She is waxed old: it has ceased to be with her after the manner of women." She counts nearly ninety years, and is nevertheless still considered not unworthy a royal bed.

Notwithstanding the sneer of Voltaire, beauty is not necessarily incompatible with the age of Sarah. Brantome¹ thus graphically describes Madame de Valentinois: "J'ai vue Madame de Valentinois, en l'âge de soixante-dix aussi belle de face, aussi fraîche, et aussi aimable, comme en l'âge de trente ans. Aussi fust-elle fort aimée et servie *d'un des grands roys et valeureux du monde*. Je le puis dire franchement et sans faire tort à la beauté de cette dame; car toute dame aimée d'un grand roy, c'est signe que la perfection habite et abonde en elle, qui la fait aimer: aussi la beauté donnée des cieux ne doit être épargnée des demy-dieux. *Je vis cette dame six mois avant qu'elle mourust, si belle encore*, que je ne sçache cœur de rocher qui ne s'en fust emeu, encore qu'auparavant, elle se fust rompu une jambe sur le pavé d'Orléans, allant et se tenant à cheval aussi dextrement et disposement, comme elle avait jamais fait; mais le cheval tomba et glissa sous elle. Et pour telle rupture et maux de douleurs qu'elle endura, il eut semblé que sa belle face s'en fut

¹ Discours v, Des Vieilles Amoureuses.

changée, mais rien moins que cela ; car sa beauté, sa grace, sa majesté, sa belle apparence estoient toute pareille, qu'elle avait toujours eu ; et surtout elle avait une très grande blancheur, et sans se farder aucunement : mais on dit bien que tous les matins elle usoit de quelques bouillons composez d'or potable, et autres drogues, que je ne scay pas, comme les bons médecins et doctes apothécaires. Je croy que si cette dame *fust encore rescu cent ans qu'elle n'eust jamais vielly, fust de visage*, tant il estoit bien composé ; *fust de corps caché et couvert*, tant il estoit de bonne trempe et de belle habitude. C'est dommage que la terre couvre un si beau corps."

In this heaven-descended dream² which visits Abimelech, we may observe,

I. That it is made no matter of reproach to him, that he has taken away a woman, and most probably without her consent, from her family and friends ; but that he has taken a woman who "was married to an husband."³ The woman in these times seems to have been, like the common earth, which became the property of him who first chose to occupy it ; she was a thing, and sacred only as the goods and chattels of the man.

II. That Abimelech's justification of his conduct, or rather the manner in which that justification is received by the Elohim, sufficiently evidences, in so far as the Elohim is concerned,

1st. That sin consists in the mere doing of some forbidden act, without any reference to the animus of the agent ;⁴ and that consequently a man may sin through ignorance, may sin through accident, may sin unconsciously, and yet must suffer the punishment of sin, however grievous :

And 2ndly. That the same act which in one man is sin,

² In the fifteenth chapter we had an account of a vision. The vision seems to be the dream of the waking, as the dream is the vision of the sleeping, man. The mode in which the divine vision or dream occurred is given in Job iv. 13.

Compare with it Jamblichus' view of the divine dream, *De Mysteriis*, c. iii, sect. ii.

³ Marginal reading.

⁴ This is quite in accordance with the laws of the Elohim against manslaughter in chap. ix.

and sin worthy of death, is in another to all appearance no sin whatever. For, suppose that events had followed their natural course: then, though unintentionally, Abimelech would have committed an act of adultery with Sarah, and would have been accounted guilty of and punished for the sin; while, on the other hand, it would seem that both Sarah who knowingly gave up her body to another than her husband, and her husband who timorously connived at his own and his wife's dishonour, would have been held blameless, and perhaps made as they now are the arbiters of Abimelech's fate. Yes, the honest Abimelech must be punished and must suffer death, unless with gifts he can pacify this false pair, and through their intercession obtain his pardon. Such is the sentence, such the equal justice of the Elohim!

Verse 9. Abimelech, *first*, in his answer to the Elohim: "Lord, wilt thou also slay a righteous nation?" and *now* again, in his remonstrance with Abraham, "thou hast brought on me and on my kingdom a great sin:" associates his people with himself, and seems to take it for granted that they were to share in his crime and in his punishment. Does not this show us that the ancient Hebrew world, like the ancient Persian⁵ or Greek,⁶ saw in the prince the whole nation? and believed that, as the inferior animal creation existed for man's use and benefit and followed man's fortunes, so the subject existed solely and exclusively for the sake, and therefore followed the fortunes, of his sovereign? Or, in other words, were not the people merely things, incapable of doing God service as priests,⁷ or their fellows service as leaders in war or legislators in peace, and only fitted therefore to become the instruments of a royal will?

⁵ Vide Fargard ii, which shows us the earth peopled and made fruitful for the sake of Djemschid.

⁶ Vide Wachsmuth, Hist. Antiq. of Greece, p. 123; and the opening

of the CEd. Tyrannus of Sophocles.

⁷ The very position of the Hebrews in relation to the rest of mankind is formed on some view of this sort.

Verses 11-13. Abraham excuses himself to Abimelech.

I. "Because I thought the fear of God is not in this place and they will slay me for my wife's sake."^a Had not Abraham the promise of God, that by his wife, Sarah, he was to become the father of a great nation? His hour then was not yet come. But where in the meanwhile was that faith which had been accounted to him for righteousness? Did it fail him as difficulties and dangers approached? When fear pressed upon him did he not forget his God, and put his trust in a falsehood, *i. e.* in the wicked one who is the father of lies? So it would seem, though he excuses himself,

II. By the fact that Sarah is indeed his sister, "the daughter of my father, though not of my mother." But is not this a poor prevarication? For was it not his intention to deceive Abimelech; and was not his motive a mean and paltry one—his own ease, comfort and safety? I speak however let it be remembered as a man of the fifty-ninth century judging a man of the nineteenth, as one morality would judge another. And as I conceive that Abraham's actions were not in opposition to his views of duty, I therefore condemn *his conduct only*, which necessarily took a colouring from the times in which he lived; but while I condemn it, I cease not to love and admire *his character*. In other words I see that his standard of morality was low, but that it may have been high compared with that of his neighbours, and that its precepts were strictly adhered to. Hence his claim to be great and good:^a—and how much greater and better than we! who, though we stand on the mount which he first raised and to which

^a Menu justifies under certain circumstances false evidence "from a pious motive" (chap. viii. 103), and "whenever the death of a man, who had not been a grievous offender.....would be occasioned by true evidence, falsehood may be spoken; it is even preferable to truth" (§ 104): compare Sophocles, *Philoct.* 109. In the eyes of Menu

Abraham was justified in his lie.

⁹ The Koran (chap. xxxix) asks, "Shall they who know their duty, and they who know it not, be held equal?" Though evidently not so put, this is a question of degree merely, and a question which none can answer. The real essential difference is between those who do their duty and those who do it not.

forty centuries have each been adding more or less of height, have but extended our views, but learned to judge and perhaps to despise, without gaining that simplicity and largeness of heart which in him prevented those contradictions between the internal and the external man that make us so little and so miserable.

Some commentators have been very anxious to prove that Sarah was Abraham's niece,¹ and not his sister. Why, I do not know. Time and experience only could teach us that marriage between persons so near of kin was physically² and morally injurious; and if Sarah was indeed Abraham's sister, it only proves that in his age such marriages were not considered incestuous, though the whole of this story shows that even then they must have been rare.

Verse 16. This is a much vexed verse, and there are several translations³ of it which differ considerably from

¹ For the advantage of those who are especially in love with this conjecture, I will observe that in India, an uncle may marry his niece, the daughter of his sister, though not his niece the daughter of his brother; that there in fact the descendants of the masculine line may intermarry with those of the feminine, though neither the masculine nor the feminine line are ever permitted to marry among themselves; because all the children of the same line, "continuent de génération en génération de s'appeller entre eux frère et sœur, aussi long-temps qu'il est connu dans le public qu'ils dérivent d'une même source"..... "Un homme épouseroit donc sa sœur, dit-on, si les enfans se marient entre eux dans l'une ou l'autre de ces deux lignes; tandis que les enfans de la ligne masculine ne donnant pas le nom de frère et de sœur à ceux de la ligne féminine et *vice versâ*, mais se désignant entre eux par leurs noms personnels, on peut et même on doit épouser la fille de sa

sœur, mais jamais celle de son frère."—Dubois, *Mœurs des Indes*, vol. i, p. 11. A similar custom prevails among the Iroquois, and is indeed brought forward by Lafitau to explain the relationship which existed between Abraham and Sarah: "Parmi les Iroquois et parmi les Hurons tous les enfans d'une cabane regardent comme leurs mères toutes les sœurs de leurs mères, et comme leurs oncles tous les frères de leurs mères; par la même raison, ils donnent le nom de père à tous les frères de leurs pères, et de tantes à toutes les sœurs de leurs pères. Tous les enfans du côté de la mère et de ses sœurs, du père et de ses frères, se regardent entre eux légalement comme frères et sœurs; mais par rapport aux enfans de leurs oncles et tantes, *i. e.*, des frères de leurs mères et des sœurs de leurs pères, il ne les traitent que sur le pied de cousin." *Mœurs des Sauvages*, vol. i, p. 552.

² Vide however *infra*, observations on the fourth verse of chap. xxiv.

³ Consult Schumann *ad* h. l.

that in our Bible. Boothroyd⁴ has rendered the passage thus: "I have given to thy brother one thousand pieces of silver to purchase veils for thee and all that are with thee." Michaelis:⁵ "But unto Sarah he said, I have placed with thy brother a thousand shekels of silver, with it buy thee a veil and wear it everywhere, so that every man may know that thou art married." De Wette:⁶ "And to Sarah he said, Behold I have given thy brother a thousand shekels of silver, with it buy thee a veil and wear it before all that are with thee and before all other, so that thou mayest be distinguished." Which of these translations is the best it is not for me to decide: I will but transcribe from Burckhardt⁷ some Arabian customs which may perhaps explain the passage. "In the interior of the Desert, even in Hedjaz, and as I understood likewise in Yemen," he tells us, "the Bedouin women usually go unveiled. All the Bedouins who are connected in intercourse with Egypt, oblige their women to wear veils before strangers." And in another place, among the ceremonies of marriage, he mentions, "that the bride is taken to her father's tent by the young men, who then place her in the women's apartments; and one of the bridegroom's relatives immediately throws over her an abba or man's cloak, completely enveloping her head, and exclaims, 'None shall cover thee but such an one.'" Both these Arab customs⁸ would illustrate this verse as translated by Michaelis and De Wette.

Verse 18. All these transactions must have taken place between the visit of Jehovah to Mamre and the birth of Isaac, *i. e.* in a period of time somewhat less than a year;

⁴ From Roberts' Illustrations of Scripture, ad h. l.

⁵ "Zur Zara sagte er: Ich habe deinem Bruder tausend Seckel Silber zugestellt; für die kaufe einen Schleyer, und trage ihn überall, damit jedermann wisse du verheyrathet bist."

⁶ "Und zu Zara sprach er: Siehe! ich habe tausend Seckel Sil-

bers deinem Bruder gegeben; dafür kaufe dir einen Schleyer, und trage ihn vor allen, die mit dir sind, und vor allen andern, damit du ausgezeichnet seyst."

⁷ Notes on the Bedouins, vol. i, p. 234.

⁸ See also Chardin, Voyages en Perse, vol. ii, p. 50, Veils of the Armenian women.

and as Abimelech does not seem to have been aware that Sarah was a married woman, we may suppose that they happened in the earlier part of that period. How then could Abimelech in this short space have ascertained that the wombs of his house were closed up?

But again this curse of barrenness, applied to the women of a country, and one of the favourite afflictions with which in Greece⁹ the angry Deity visits his offending worshippers—is it the curse of a merely fertile and fearful imagination? Or had the ancient men observed, that periods of calamity were periods of barrenness? Or did they suppose that as there are years of deficient harvest so there are also others in which the number of births is much below the average? Did they in a word imagine a fact or account for one? I suspect that modern statistics would show that in a given number of years the same number of marriages produce about the same number of children.¹ I speak however without book.

In this chapter we find mention for the first time of dreams and prophets. We may observe

i. Of dreams: that a faith in them is among the superstitions of uncivilised and half-civilised man. Thus though the Zendavesta is silent on this matter, from the Zerdust-namah,² which relates a prophetic dream of Dogdo the mother of Zoroaster, and speaks also of interpreters of dreams, we may gather that in ancient Persia dreams were both observed and studied. Among the Egyptians, so early as the time of Joseph, they were regarded as prophetic, and the task of interpreting them was entrusted to a learned and honourable profession.³ In the Chou-king

⁹ Hesiod, ut supra. Sophocles Œd. Tyran. 179, shows us Thebes suffering the same afflictions as Gerar:

Ουτε γαρ
εκγονα κλυτας χθυνος
αυζεται, ουτε τοκοισιν
ικων καματων ανεχουσι
γυναικες.

—and suffering them from the same

reasons,—the unconscious crimes of its prince.

¹ I have presumed the contrary (note³, p. 149) on no sufficient evidence.

² Vide Vie de Zoroastre, Zend. vol. i, p. 11 and 12.

³ Vide Genesis xl. 8; xli. 8; and compare xli. 16.

of the Chinese, it is in dreams that the sovereign of heaven communicates his will to the sovereign of the earth.² In Homer they come from Jove;³ and by Greeks and Romans it was believed, that in the solitude of caves and groves and temples, the Gods appeared in dreams, and in dreams deigned an answer to their votaries.⁴ Among the Hindus they give a colouring to the whole business of life; "men and women take long journies, perform arduous penances, and go through expensive ceremonies from no other cause than a dream."⁵ Among the North American Indians *all dreams* are of importance, but some are of that mysterious fatality to the dreamer, so intimately connected with his well-being and even his existence, that to obtain their fulfilment becomes the one object of his thoughts and the aim of all his endeavours.⁶ Among the Hebrews an extraordinary power was attributed to them. Their divine nature is, at least tacitly, acknowledged in the Hebrew Scripture; in it they appear *sometimes* as express revelations from the Deity, *at others*, as warnings and as prophecies of future events. And the Jews, like the Heathen nations around them, to obtain happy dreams or to avert the ill omen of a dream, often imposed fasts and penances on themselves, and like them had both rules for explaining, and learned men whose honourable profession it was to interpret dreams.⁷

But whence this faith in dreams? We may ascribe it

1st. To that horror of accidents which characterizes *infant* no less than *civilised* man. With infant man every thing has a cause, every thing a meaning⁸ and a purpose.

² Vide Chou-king, part iii, chap. viii, p. 123, &c.

³ Iliad ii. 65.

⁴ Cicero, De Divinatione, lib i, § xliii; Æneid viii; Vossius, De Idololat. lib. iii, c. xxxv.

⁵ Roberts' Illustrations of Scripture, ad Deuter. xiii. 5.

⁶ Lafitau, Mœurs des Sauvages, vol. i, p. 363-7.

⁷ For the Jewish doctrine on

dreams, vide Lightfoot, Horæ Heb. in Evan. Matt. xxiv. 24; for the Hindu, Roberts, ut supra; for the Greek and Roman, Le Loyer, Hist. des Spectres, liv. iv, c. xxii; Cardan, Synes Somnior.; and Rossini Roman. Antiquit. lib. ii, c. ii, p. 87.

⁸ "As believing," says Lord Herbert of Cherbury, "that nothing in the order of the universe could be very rare or infrequent,

But as infant man does not, like us, study the meanings and purposes of things in the things themselves, but in things as they affect him: as he refers every thing to himself: he accounts for every unexpected occurrence, not by attaching it to some physical laws, never mind how absurd, but by supposing it the consequence of a direct interposition of the Deity, for the purpose of reward, or punishment, or warning. Hence a habit of viewing the accidental as the expression of the Divine will; and in time the choice of particular classes of accidents as a means, according to certain rules, of ascertaining the Divine intentions in the government of the world. Hence the prophetic powers, which, in one place or another, have been attributed to the lines on the tortoise' back, or to thunder, or to the flights of birds, or the feeding of chickens, or the entrails of sacrificed animals, but which every where seem to have been allowed to lots and dreams.⁹

without some meaning. In the consideration of which also the time and place were remarked, they of the common sort in general being thought to divine best, out of some *impetus naturalis*, did as it were unawares speak their opinion; and not sneezing only on a sudden, but itching, panting, shaking, and trembling of certain limbs or parts of the body, had their interpretation."—Dialogue between a Tutor and a Pupil, p. 147.

⁹ I will venture on an imperfect classification of some of those accidents which different nations have regarded as prophetic. These are:

1. Dreams, ut supra.

II. Lots, as in the case of Achan (Josh. vii. 14); of Jonathan (1 Sam. xiv); as in China by the *Pou*, and afterwards by the Y-king, the Sortes Virgilianæ or Biblicæ of Europe, (Chou-king, p. 28; and Mémoires des Chinois, vol. ii, p. 62); and by the dice and Fals among the Parsis (Zend. i, part i, p. 318), &c.

III. Natural Phenomena, as

thunder, monstrous births, the direction of fire, &c.

IV. The fortuitous expressions of individuals under particular circumstances; as in the words of the garrison at Michmash to Jonathan (1 Sam. xiv. 9), of the Pythoness to Alexander, of his daughter Tertia to L. Paulus (Cicero, De Divin. lib. i, § xlv; and compare Plutarch, De Is. et Osir. § xiv), of his dependent to the Brahmin minister ("Mudra Rakshusa," Wilson's Hindu Theatre, vol. ii, p. 162), of the psalm which determined Clovis to invade the Burgundians (Sismondi, Hist. des Français, part i, c. v), &c.

V. The involuntary motions of rational beings, as sneezing, the throbbing of the eye among the Hindus (Wilson, Hindu Theatre, vol. ii, p. 177), the Peruvians (Sittem d. Wilden, vol. i, p. 150).

VI. The motions of irrational animals, as the flight and songs of birds, &c. among the Tuscans, Cilicians, &c. (Cicero, De Divin. § i.)

And 2ndly. To a dim perception of the spiritual nature of the soul and of the Divine Being. The phenomena of sleep attract the wandering and indolent attention of the barbarian; its mysteries stir him to thought. He lies on his couch with outstretched limbs; his eyes are closed; all his senses numbed. He sees not the loved faces which are gathered around him; he heeds not the festal meats which await his presence; he is indifferent alike to the shout of revelry and the wailings of sorrow. But what pleasant visions greet his sight! to what "spirit voices of no tone" does he so delightedly listen! what rich perfumes so gratefully inhale! these plains too in which he wanders with so unconstrained a step, and these beings with whom he mixes in such happy converse, are they not, though never seen by the bodily eye, familiar to him? Is not this the old country? are not these the old familiar faces? Is he not native here? is not this his home? and does he not begin to believe that

"The soul that rises with us, our life's star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar"?

—that, imprisoned in the body, it loses its ancient freedom, but that in sleep it escapes from the trammels of sense, and ranges abroad to its former haunts; and then more clearly expresses its wishes or its fears, or enters into more intimate connexion with its Lord,¹ and hence in its dreams foresees and prophecies?

We may observe,

II. Of prophets: that they are not peculiar to this or that nation, but that they belong to infant Humanity. If we direct our view to the ancient world, we find, that their counsels determined the political conduct of the Canaanite² people generally; that in Egypt they formed the highest order of the priesthood;³ and that Greece and Rome listened

¹ Vide Lafitau ut sup. and Jamblachus de Mysteriis, chap. iii, § iii.

² Vide Jeremiah xxvii. 9.

³ "One of the principal grades of

to their voice in the ravings of the Pythoness or the dark sayings of the Sibyls. And if we examine the uncivilized nations of our day, among them also we trace the prophetic character more or less developed: first, in the Angetkok of the Esquimaux, who with violent gestures and loud threats compels the storm to silence, and ensures to his family success in their fishing expeditions.⁴ Secondly, in the Koedesnik of the Somojedes, who stands in close relation with the evil spirit, and is consequently enabled to give counsel and assistance to those who are either sick or unfortunate.⁵ Thirdly, in the Schaman of the Tartars, who, clothed in his magic robes and jingling his bells and beating his tambourine, with strange grimaces and fearful contortions and loud cries calls down his familiar spirit and then pronounces his divinations.⁶ Fourthly, in the Piaye of the Caribbees, who, after long fasts and much self-inflicted torment and large draughts of tobacco-juice, obtains the favour of a demon, and is then invested with the power of curing diseases and invoking with magic song his master spirit.⁷ And fifthly, in the Fetissero of the

the priesthood was the prophets. They were particularly versed in all matters relating to religion, the laws, the worship of the Gods..... and when any new regulations were introduced in affairs of religion, they, with the chief priests, were the first consulted."—Wilkinson's Egypt, vol. i, p. 264. And Diodorus tells us of the Egyptian priests, that they were both astrologers and historians,—astrologers to disclose the future, historians to exemplify by facts, &c.—lib. i, § 73.

⁴ From Parry.

⁵ Hist. Gen. des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 508. "Ils font peu de cas de leurs idoles; et s'ils s'en chargent, ce n'est que par l'attachement qu'ils paroissent avoir aux traditions de leurs ancêtres, dont les Koedesniks sont les dépositaires et les interprètes."....."S'ils font quelque cas des conseils de leurs Koedes-

niks, ce n'est qu'à cause des relations qu'ils croient qu'ils ont avec l'être malin."... "Il n'est question de leurs Koedesniks, ni à l'occasion de leurs mariages, &c.; tout le ministère de ces prêtres se borne à leur donner des avis et des idoles de leur façon, lorsqu'il arrive qu'ils sont plus malheureux que de coutume dans leurs chasses, ou lorsqu'il leur arrive quelque maladie."—id. p. 509.

⁶ Muller says of the Schamans: "C'est pour eux un furieux travail que leurs sortilèges. Les sauts, les mouremens, et les contorsions extraordinaires qu'ils font, joints à la pésanteur de leur robes, les fatignent beaucoup; aussi les voit-on tout trempés de sueur, et même écumant."—Hist. Gén. des Voyages, vol. xviii, pp. 179 and 278.

⁷ Lafitau, Mœurs des Sauvages, vol. i, p. 349.

African, to whom all things sacred are known, and who can therefore answer all questions relating to the past and the future; who has control over the winds and the storm; and who is enabled to give health to the sick, and happiness to the dead.⁸

But to leave these diviners or sorcerers, and to turn to the prophet. The Hebrew prophet seen in Abraham or rather Moses, is the friend and favourite of the Deity. He is one whose prayers and wishes the Deity hastens to fulfil, and one therefore who can work much weal or woe on his fellow-men; hence their fear of him, and their eagerness to secure his intercession, to employ him to pray and to mediate for them, to institute him their priest.⁹

Again, he is one with whom the Deity deigns to converse: the Deity loves to call him to His counsels and to open to him His designs; He does not disdain to answer his questions, to remove his doubts, and even occasionally to receive his suggestions: hence it is that to the prophet the secrets of the past and the future are alike known, and that he appears as cosmogonist, lawgiver, and seer.

But if now we with Moses compare his successors in the prophetic office, we find that they possessed a small portion only of his dignity and his privileges. Like him indeed they were set apart from the common herd of men, and like him honoured as the favoured servants of their God; like him they worked miracles, and like him were made acquainted with the great secrets of futurity. But

⁸ One of these is thus spoken of among negroes themselves: "Il avoit sous ses ordres les vents et les tempêtes. Quoique sa maison fut sans toit, il étoit toujours à couvert de la pluie. Non seulement il avoit le connoissance de toutes les choses passées, mais il lisoit dans l'avenir comme s'il eût été présent. Il guérissoit toutes sortes de maladies. Les habitans de son canton assuroient que tous ceux qui avoient vécu dans son canton paroïssoient devant lui après leur mort,

et qu'étant porté à l'indulgence, il envoyoit le plus grand nombre dans une région de bonheur," &c.—Hist. Gén. des Voyages, vol. iv, p. 171.

⁹ Compare with this description of the Hebrew prophet the high character of the Egyptian priesthood in Creuzer, Symbolik, vol. i, ii, p. 322.

¹ "The Lord God will do nothing; but He revealeth His secret unto His prophets," &c.—Amos iii. 7, 8. See also Moses passim.

they do not like him dwell in the presence of the Elohim; nor like him speak with Jehovah face to face. They saw and conversed with their God in dreams or visions only; or from time to time they heard His voice, or were visited by His spirit. They were not prophets habitually, constantly—prophets in soul, by right of birth; they wore their mantle uneasily, like usurpers; their inspiration was an oppression from which they would willingly have fled;² a madness³ which sometimes hurried them away, whither they could not foresee;⁴ and sometimes urged them to great coarseness of expression and gross indecency of act.⁵

Of these later prophets, we may, from the sacred books, though it must be allowed not always very distinctly, gather,

1. That they were restricted to no particular tribe (1 Sam. x, 12; Amos i, 1):

2. That they were especially educated for the sacred office⁶ (vide Amos vii, 14); and while so educating were called “sons of the prophets:” (1 Kings xx, 35; 2 Kings ii, 2; &c.):

3. That this their education included music and singing (1 Sam. x, 5; 1 Chron. xxv, 1-3), and instruction in the laws and history of their nation, as we may gather, both from the frequent allusions which they make in their prophecies to past events, and from the histories which they themselves have written: (as the Books of Samuel, &c.; and see 2 Chron. xii, 15):

4. That they were collected together into schools or

² Vide Jonah i, 4; Jeremiah i, 6; Ezekiel ii, 8; and so also the Pythoness often shuddered away from the convulsions of inspiration.

³ Vide 2 Kings ix. 11. So Porphyry among the causes of prophecy places madness: *Ἡ ἐν τοῖς νοσημασι συμπιπτονσα μανία*. So also Plato in Timæo, ix, 301: *μαντικὴν ἀφροσύνη θεοῦ ἀνθρώπων δέδωκεν*, &c.

⁴ Vide 1 Kings xviii, 12. “And it shall come to pass as soon as I am gone from thee that the spirit of God shall carry thee whither I know not,” &c.—1 Sam. xviii, 10; 2 Kings ii, 16; and Acts viii, 39.

⁵ Ezekiel xvi; Hosea i, ii; Isai. xx: and 1 Samuel xix, 24.

⁶ So also the Egyptian priests; vide from Wilkinson, *supra*.

colleges, as at Gibeah (1 Sam. x, 5), Ramah (id. xix, 18, 20), Bethel and Jericho (2 Kings, ii, 3, 4; and vi, 1), and Gilgal (2 Kings iv, 38):

5. That at least in Israel the general rule was, that none but those who were licensed by these colleges were permitted to prophesy.⁷ See the reproach of Amaziah to Amos, and Amos's answer (Amos vii. 10, 17), and the surprise which Saul's prophetic fury excited (1 Sam. x, 11):

6. That the number of these licensed prophets was considerable—thus Ahab gathers four hundred of them in one place and for one purpose (1 Kings, xxii, 6; 1 Sam. x. 5)—and that of them many prophesied either inspired by a lying spirit as Zedekiah and the other prophets of Ahab (1 Kings id.), or “out of their own hearts following their own imaginations (Ezek. xiii, Jeremiah xxiii):

7. That the prophets prophesied either spontaneously, urged on by some sudden and irresistible impulse, as Amos; or at the instigation and to gratify the wishes of those who came to consult them, as Micaiah, &c. (1 Kings xxii):

8. That the prophets did not wholly devote themselves to prophesying in the strict sense of the term: they were not seers or diviners merely, they were preachers also; they employed themselves, both in instructing the people in the duties of religion (2 Kings iv. 23), and in educating those who were destined to the prophetic office (2 Kings vi, 1):

9. That as preachers they were

1st. Moral reformers. They insisted on the moral degradation of the people, and exhorted them to repentance;⁸ they expounded to them the laws of Moses, and gave to his institutions a spiritual meaning. In times of prosperity, when the half-

⁷ See in Lafitau, *ut supra*, the long mortification, the torments which among savage nations the aspirant to the divining office must undergo; all which implies that

the diviners were among them a class, an order. With these however contrast the simple ordination of Elisha, 1 Kings xxii, and 2 Kings ii.

⁸ Vide Ezekiel iii, 15, 21.

barbarian, happy and secure, is neglectful of his God's service, they threatened the nation with disgrace and misfortune, the divine vengeance: and in the hour of distress, when, oppressed by foreign enemies or torn by intestine divisions, Israel in dust and ashes bowed himself to the earth and broken-hearted sought the altar of God, they roused him to hope, they reminded him of the promises made to his fathers, of the sovereignty to which he was certainly destined; and their hearts then swelling with joy poured themselves out in words of universal peace, in blessings in which all living things were comprehended.

And 2dly. Statesmen. They warned away the people from all association with their Heathen neighbours; in times of war and invasion they watched with anxious eye the actions and councils of the sovereign, they pointed out to him all the dangers of foreign and mercenary assistance,⁹ and they urged him to put his trust in God and his own forces. To the last they kept alive the national spirit and the national honour; and when they saw their country subdued by the all-powerful Chaldeans, they were the first to suit themselves to existing circumstances, and the first to predict the uselessness of resistance and all the consequences of rebellion.¹

10. That as seers they were sometimes attached to the service of men in power, as Gad, David's seer: and were consulted about things hidden and future, as to the issue of an illness or a battle,² or the fate of property which had been stolen or lost, &c.³ They foretold both changes of weather and changes of dynasties, and the fate of a sinning nation and that of a meddling courtier, &c.⁴

⁹ Isaiah vii.

¹ Jeremiah, Zedekiah, &c.

² Vide 2 Kings i, 3; and 1 Kings
xxii.

³ As Samuel about Saul's asses,

¹ Samuel ix.

⁴ 1 Kings xviii, 41; and 2 Kings
vii, 19.

11. That they performed miracles ; thus they now make iron to swim, and now multiply a pot of oil till it fills many vessels ; now they bring down fire from heaven to destroy their enemies, and now raise the dead to life ; and now they curse, and now afflict with disease.⁵

12. That they considered music⁶ favourable to inspiration ; thus Saul, when he meets the prophets coming down from Bethel with psaltery and tabret and harp, falls to prophesying ; and Elisha sends for a minstrel to play before him when he would prophesy to Jehoshaphet (1 Kings iii).

13. That their prophecies were often accompanied by symbolical action. Thus Zedekiah puts horns upon his head (1 Kings xxii), and Isaiah walks naked and barefoot (Isaiah xx), and Hosea “ loves a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress ” (Hosea iii).

14. That they subsisted partly on the rewards of divination (1 John ix), partly on the presents they received from those whom they cured, or who had consulted them in sickness (2 Kings v, 20), and partly on the kindness of the pious (2 Kings iv, 8, &c.)⁷

15. That they clothed themselves rudely, wearing girdles of leather (2 Kings i, 8) and rough mantles⁸ of hair (Zechariah xiii, 4) ; and that they were accustomed to long fasts⁹ (1 Kings xix) ; and that they lived apart from the

⁵ Vide the lives of Elijah and Elisha, and compare them with the account of the great negro Fetisero quoted above.

⁶ So Porphyry, Epist. ad Anat. Ως των εξισταμενων ἐνιοι τινες αυτων ακουοντες η κυμβαλων, η τυμπανων, η τινος μελους ενθυσιωσιν, ὡς οἱ τε Κόρυβαντιζομενοι, &c.

⁷ Though the prophet might receive presents, I suspect that to prophecy for gain was a reproach. So Œdipus of Tiresias :

Ὑφεις μαγον τοιον δε μηχανορραφον,

δολιον, αγγυρτην, ὅστις εν τοις κερδεσι μονον δεδορκε. Tyran. 395.

And is not Balaam's covetousness, his willingness to let himself out for money, the great charge against him ?

⁸ So the Schamans of the Tartars, ut supra. Students in theology, among the Hindus, “ wear for their mantles the hides of black antelopes.”—Menu, vol. ii, p. 41.

⁹ In a note to the thirteenth chapter of the Koran, Salé observes from Mainonides, “ that it is a

common herd of men, and only communicated with them through means of their servants or scholars (2 Kings iv. 27 ; v. 10).

16. That though sometimes persecuted because of the unwelcome truths it was often their duty to make known, they were in general held in high honour. Thus even Elisha (1 Kings iv, 13) speaks of himself as of one who had influence at court; and Elijah is addressed with all humility by Obadiah the governor of the house of Ahab, &c. (1 Kings xviii).

17. In conclusion we may observe that, *as* Scripture is silent with regard to the acts and persons of the prophets of Judea, though all its prophecies—which do not merely relate to passing events, which have a moral and human and therefore lasting interest—are from their lips or pens; *so* on the other hand, it is diffuse in its account of the actions and miracles of the great seers² of Israel, though as evidence of their prophetic powers it has preserved for us only a few local divinations.

If now we compare the prophet of Scripture with the prophet as he appears in those religions to which we have more particularly directed our attention, and as he appears—

i. In the Brahminical creed. The Hindu legends tell of the extraordinary powers of Brahmins learned in theology, and of their miracles which rival those of an Elijah or an Elisha;³ and every Hindu town even at this day possesses its diviner, who is called upon to display his skill in nearly

maxim with the Jews, that nothing is more repugnant to prophecy than carnality.”—Koran, vol. ii, p. 58.

¹ 2 Sam. xv. 27.

² The seer of Israel was partly Schaman, partly Angetkok, partly Fetissero, &c. The prophet of Judea is without a type among idolatrous heathen nations.

³ According to the Vedas, the most learned, the most skilled in theology has extraordinary powers. Thus, in the contest between Yaj-

nyawalcya and Sa'calya as to who is most skilled in theology, Yajnyawalcya asks his adversary a question and declares, “if thou art not able to explain this thy head shall drop off. Sa'calya could not explain it, and his head did drop off;” and (Asiatic Researches, vol. viii, p. 447) see also an account of the contest between the rejected and the sacred priests of Asama'ti (Id. p. 394), and compare with it Elisha's contest with the priests of Baal.

the same way as were formerly the seers of Israel.⁴ India has its seers. But as the Vedas—though here and there indeed a hymn bears the name of some royal personage or saintly priest⁵—are the production of the Deity himself;⁶ and as all the reforms⁷ or changes which the Brahminical religion has undergone, or will undergo, are and must be attributed to an avatar or incarnation of one of the three persons of the great Trimurti; to this religion the idea of a prophet, as we see it realised in Moses, or even in the Isaiah and Ezekiel of Judea, is unnecessary and unknown.

II. In the Zend creed. The Zendavesta contains the law given of God, and announced to man first by Hom, afterwards by Zoroaster. Hom and Zoroaster then are prophets; and we may compare them, *the one* with Abraham, *the other* with Moses.⁸ Hom like Abraham professes to worship the Creator God alone; like him he is put forward as the inspired author of a new ritual, the founder of a new religion.⁹ *The former* however is an

⁴ Of the soothsayers in India Forbes says: "Although I do not liken them to Samnel and the early prophets, I often found them and their employers entertaining the same ideas and following the same practice as is recorded of the seers of Palestine, especially in the little story told of Saul and his servant, &c. Such is exactly the state of things in the eastern district of Guzerat; every considerable town has its soothsayer, who is consulted on all occasions."—*Oriental Memoirs*, vol. ii, p. 115, 116; and see an account of the prediction made to Mr. Hodges that he should one day be governor of Bombay.—*Ib.* p. 118.

⁵ Of the Rigveda, Colebrooke informs us that "several persons of royal birth are mentioned among the authors of the hymns which constitute this Veda" (*Asiatic Researches*, vol. viii, p. 392), sages,

priests, and monarchs also (*Ib.* p. 393); they are the authors only as they are the first to whom the sacred text was revealed.

⁶ Vide p. 330, *supra*.

⁷ Vide p. 111, *supra*.

⁸ To these may be added, and they answer to the prophets of Judea, Ireschoster.....Aderbad, Mahrespend, &c., who have taught the law of Zoroaster, "l'ont fait pratiquer publiquement aux purs du monde"....."restaurateurs de la sainteté.....qu'ils ont rendu brillante."—*Patet de l'Iran, Zend.* vol. ii, p. 49.

⁹ "Vous êtes le premier, O Grand (Hom), à qui Ormuzd ait donné l'Evanguin et le Ladéré (vêtements) utiles donnés du ciel avec la pure loi des MazdeiesnansAprès l'avoir ceint (l'Evanguin) sur les montagnes.....vous avez annoncé la parole sur les montagnes." *Ha ix, Zend.* vol. i, p. 112.

isolated individual, *the latter* the lord and father of a family, or horde; *this* therefore delivers the ordinances of the Elohim to his household, while *that* preaches the heaven-descended law among the few mountain shepherds his neighbours. In time however the family grows into a people, and the shepherds become numerous and powerful, settle themselves in towns and acquire the habits of citizens. But the religion and rites which the one and the other had received from their ancestors were now found insufficient to fill the heart and soul of a nation, and were in danger therefore of being put aside for other and strange superstitions,¹ unless they could be adapted to the more complicated wants of a civic society. And now it was that *among the one and the other people* a man of large mind arose, *here* Moses, *there* Zoroaster,² who, having collected and ordered the traditions and customs of his fathers and suited them to the exigences of the times, framed from them a new ritual and a body of laws, which, though they already bear the sanction of antiquity, he besides issues as the revealed will and unchangeable law of his God.³ Hence

Of these garments, Anquetil tells us: "La ceinture et l'espèce de chemise qui forment le sceau du vrai disciple de Zoroastre sont les habits de combat."—Syst. Theol. vol. ii, p. 616. These garments thus answer to the circumcision of Abraham.

¹ See an account of the various religions which occupied Persia when Zoroaster appeared. (Vie de Zoroastre, Zend, vol. i. p. 67.) To the many superstitions which obtained among the Israelites, the books of Moses everywhere bear testimony.

² Vide Vie de Zoroastre, p. 68.

³ The Israelites are a nation because they have a common descent, a common worship, and one Deity. The Ormuzd worshippers are not of one stock, and their religion is their one sole bond of union. And union their religion every way inculcates, not politically or morally

merely, by commanding obedience to the government and insisting on the advantages of union, but by knitting the prayers and the good works of each individual to the prayers and the good works of all the faithful, both who exist and have existed. (Vide Syst. Theol. Zend. vol. ii, p. 595.) Hence the frequent mention of celebrated saints and prophets in the prayers of the Parsees: (vide Patet de l'Iran. Nireng Boni Daden, &c. Zend, vol. ii, p. 41, 51):—and because these saints are living personages, and living in the very presence of Ormuzd, and powerful against the Dews, the frequent invocation of them, as of Hom. (Ha ix.) But again, as the saints of heaven are able to assist the faithful of earth, so also the saints of earth can by their prayers assist the dead who have died in sin. Hence with

it is that in both creeds the prophetic glories of Moses and Zoroaster have eclipsed those of their predecessors; and that in both creeds they are especially represented as the mouthpieces of the Deity, the interpreters of God's will, and the preachers of God's law to man. Zoroaster however, unlike Moses, works no miracles,⁴ and possesses no supernatural powers; and though fully acquainted with the great designs of Providence in the government of the world, he has no foreknowledge of particular events. He and Hom are cosmogonists, legislators, prophets in the noblest sense, never seers.

III. In the Chinese faith. Tien or Chang-ti, sometimes the Heaven, sometimes the Lord of Heaven,⁵ a material and spiritual Being, is the Supreme God of China. And this Supreme God has selected the emperor to be his sole minister and representative on earth.⁶ From the emperor alone, at the four great yearly feasts, will he accept sacrifice: to him alone he declares his will, with him alone converses, and with him alone of men stands in relation.⁷ The emperor is the loved son of the Tien, and not merely therefore the sovereign, but also the mediator, priest and prophet of his people.

But again the air is crowded with innumerable invisible spirits, Chen,⁸ who like men are endowed with power to work, and will to choose between, good and evil: and who like men are distinguishable one from the other by differ-

prayers offered to the dead are united prayers for the dead. (Vide Zend. vol. ii, p. 603.) Thus in the Zend creed we find two of the most touching and beautiful doctrines of the Roman Catholic faith.

³ *i.e.* The Zendavesta never speaks of him as a miracle-worker; not so, however, the Zerdust-namah, a work of later date. Vide Vie de Zoroastre, Zend. vol. i.

⁵ The authors to the preliminary dissertation to "Confucius" assert that the Chinese called their supreme god Tien, "Heaven," because he was the Lord of Heaven,

the most beautiful of all natural objects; and that the Chinese, like other nations, use often the habitation of the person for the person himself. Vide Confucius, sive Scientia Sinensis, Præmialis Declaratio, p. 91. I do not, however, place much reliance on the conjectures of these learned Jesuits who had a theory to support.

⁶ "Hic adverte Sinas binis his litteris *tien hia*, *i.e.* quod sub caelo est, passim notare imperium suum Sinese."—Id. lib. i, § iii.

⁷ Vide Mém. Chin. xv, p. 215.

⁸ Id. ib.

ences of rank, talent and occupation ; but who all, because man is the most perfect of created beings, exist but for man's use and service, and are like man made subject to the will of the son of heaven. These spirits then, according to their several merits and capacities, the emperor names guardians, *some* of provinces, *some* of towns, *some* of villages, &c. ; while *to others* he allots certain months, days or hours during which they are to perform certain functions.⁹ *The former* provide their districts with seasonable rains and genial sunshine, and protect them from storms, inundations, earthquakes, plagues and pestilences ; *the latter* on the other hand employ themselves, *now* in assisting the labours of the husbandman, *now* in guarding the traveller, and now in furthering the claims of suitors, &c. And all of these as they fulfil or neglect their duties are rewarded with praise, statues, temples, &c. or punished by degradation and banishment to the barren air.¹ The emperor therefore is lord not only of the earth but also of nature.

But the emperor, as the Son of Heaven, is entrusted with the law of heaven : and that law the emperor must himself both sedulously observe and must oblige his officers to observe also. This is the duty attached to his office ; and when he fulfils that duty, the Mandarins then cherish the honest and peaceful citizen, and punish and repress all evil-doers ; and the Chen, kept to their labours, are careful that no natural accidents shall disturb the public weal ; and order, content, and prosperity, now reign

⁹ Mémoires des Chinois, vol. xv, p. 216 : " C'est à eux qu'il confie la garde aérienne de son empire pour le défendre de tout ce que pourroit lui être nuisible ; c'est parmi eux qu'il choisit les protecteurs particuliers de chaque ville, village, &c., et c'est à chacun d'eux qu'il assigne.....l'année, le mois, le jour, pour y présider aux affaires qu'on y traite," &c. Hence the reason why in China its occupation is assigned

to each day, and why to undertake any other occupation on that day is considered unlucky. Vide, ut supra.

¹ " S'il arrive à ces Chen de ne pas remplir leur tâche.....On les reprochent leur peu de talent, leur inattention ; on les injurie jusqu'à frapper et briser les statues qu'on les avoit assignées pour logementLes Chen ainsi dégradés vont augmenter le nombre des Chen oisifs qui peuplent les airs."—Id. p. 218.

throughout the country. Should the emperor however, forgetful of his high destinies, waste away his life in a luxurious sloth: or should he with a tyrannical rapacity violate the laws he has been chosen to administer: then his magistrates following his example will neglect to check or will perhaps even encourage crime, and the Chen no longer feeling the controlling eye over them will grow careless and indifferent to their duties. Children will now no longer listen to the wisdom of their parents; age and its counsels are despised; and disobedience, disorder, turbulence, rapine, begin to tear at the very heart of a society which long droughts, or intemperate rains and inundations and plagues and famine alternately afflict.² Here then we have a scheme of providence in which moral excellence is indissolubly bound up with temporal prosperity, and where consequently temporal misfortunes are a gage and evidence of moral guilt; and one moreover (and herein consists its peculiarity) in which that prosperity and those misfortunes, in so far as they are national, are attached to the emperor as their author. And hence it is, that when his subjects are suffering from flood or drought, the emperor retires into himself to examine how far his own conduct, or the conduct of those immediately about him, has been the cause of the national calamity.³ He comes before the Tien as a mediator for his people. And as in the presence of mankind he is the son of the Tien, so in the presence of the Tien he is the son of man—the representative of Humanity.⁴

² Vide from the Chou-king, sup. p. 286.

³ Thus Yong-tsching, before alluded to, addresses his people: "Aussitôt qu'on m'avertit que quelque province souffre, ou d'une longue sécheresse ou de l'excès des pluies, j'entre aussitôt dans moi-même, j'examine avec soin ma conduite, je pense à rectifier les dérèglements qui se seroient introduits dans mon palais.....Je m'applique à donner au Tien des marques de

droiture et de piété dans l'espérance que par une vie régulière je ferai changer la volonté que le Tien a de nous punir."—Du Halde, *Chine*, vol. iii, p. 42. I must observe, however, that this emperor rejects all belief in the Chen as a mere superstition; but it does not therefore follow that the mode of conduct which he adopts did not originate in that belief.

⁴ With this view of the Chinese popular faith, compare the view we

But the emperor we have said was a prophet: but all his predecessors have been prophets; all have obeyed the law of the Tien; in the sayings, acts, and ordinances of the first emperors then he reads that law,⁵—the great common law of mankind. But of that law the first principle is respect and reverence to parents; to obedience then to that law he joins a careful observance of those customs, &c. which are peculiar to his own family; and those customs because he is emperor become for that reason alone national. Hence it is that every change of dynasty is accompanied by a change in the ceremonial of the empire.⁶ The ancestral hall of the dethroned sovereign is violated; the high privileges his fathers enjoyed are withdrawn from them, and bestowed on the ancestors of the new emperor. They become the tutelary saints of the kingdom, the lords of the dead, as he is the lord of the living.⁷

I. We may observe that in this religion, *verbo sit venia*, and in this religion alone, man, as both physical and spiritual, is a being of a higher order than the mere spirit.

II. That the emperor is so immeasurably great, that man is as nothing before him. His greatness indeed throws not merely man but the Deity himself into the background. He stands like some Egyptian pyramid, alone in a desert of sand and sky. He occupies the whole attention of his people; they see him every where, and him only. Reverence and obedience are their duties, and

have taken of the relations which existed between the patriarch of olden times and his slaves, p. 371, 372, *supra*.

⁵ That law is contained in the sacred books of China, the Kings which were either composed by emperors, as the Y-king by Fo-hi, and part of the Chou-king by Ya: or by their order, as the Hi-ki and the Che-king: or they contain an account of the sayings, &c. of the olden emperors, as part of the Chou-king and the Tschun-tsieou

or history of the Tcheou dynasty.—Vide Chou-king, p. 409; *Mémoires des Chinois*, vol. ii, p. 62, 65; vol. viii, p. 193; and Confucius, sive Scientia Sinensis, Præmialis Declaratio, p. 15, and 88, 89, &c.

⁶ Vide Amiot, *Hist. of the Ceremonial of China*, at the close of Chou-king, p. 345.

⁷ See *Mémoires des Chinois*, vol. xv, p. 231; and the account of Ou-ouang's usurpation of the throne and of his negotiations with the Chen.—Id.

temporal comforts their highest rewards. For them the soul has no voice and no wants ; and we find, consequently that while,

III. The authority of the emperor appears wholly religious ;⁸ the obedience it commands wears a moral and political rather than a religious aspect. His government would invest itself with the dignity of a religion, but the religion of his subjects is confined to the idea of a government. Where there is no independence of thought, and the soul is chained down to earth or earthly things, religion in any true sense is impossible.

This chapter is written with the name Elohim (except the last verse, which Eichhorn supposes to be a gloss from the narrative Jehovah, introduced to complete the tale.⁹

It recounts a similar event to that which Jehovah made known in the twelfth chapter. The only difference is, that the *one* lays the scene in Gerar, the *other* in Egypt ; and that *this* is more concise and worldly, and *that* more diffuse and religious, in its details.

The last verse in this chapter written with the name Jehovah has, Eichhorn observes, a form of expression found only in the Jehovah portions of Genesis. (Vide chap. xvi, 2.)

⁸ In the next chapter (p. 448) I have noted the superstitious reverence with which the name of the Deity is generally regarded by ignorant man. In China, however—if a letter in a newspaper is any authority, and it accords well with the popular superstition of the country—it is the name of the emperor which is revered. “His real name

is seldom or ever known. Before ascending the throne, he assumes a name by which, when spoken of, he must be called ; for to pronounce or write his proper one, by accident or intention, is death to the divulger of the secret and his family.”—*Times*, Oct. 6, 1841.

⁹ Vide Einleit. im Alt. Test. vol. iii, § 416, p. 131.

CHAPTER XIX.

GENESIS xxi. 1-34.

Verses 1-7. At the birth of Isaac Abraham was a hundred, and Sarah ninety years of age. *That* however, which was a singularity, a miracle in Canaan, seems formerly to have been among the Caraihs a matter of very common occurrence: *i. e.* if we give any credit, which I do not, to the accounts early voyagers have given of these people. They often reached we are told the age of one hundred and fifty years, and among them it was nothing strange to meet with men of ninety who were fathers of infants, and women of eighty who were about to become mothers.¹ To those who sincerely believe in the possibility of miracles and yet do not love to have their faith too much tried,² this example of the Caraihs, apocryphal³ though it be, will as tending to *naturalize* another miracle, prove not unacceptable. With true Protestant spirit let them make the most of it. I must avow that if we are to believe in

¹ Of the Caribbees: "Das gewöhnliche Alter gehet bis 150 Jahre und drüber: sie sind dabey noch so stark und vermögend, das sie in 90en. Jahre noch Kinder zengen; und es soll gar nichts seltenes unter ihnen seyn, dass man Kindbetterinnen von 80 Jahren antrifft."—Sitten und Meynungen d. Wilden in Amerika, ii, p. 23.

² Thus Michaelis, for instance, somewhere expresses his regret that

the book of Jonah should be a canonical book—he would reject it if it were possible—he had rather not believe in it—he cannot digest the whale; but its authority he finds is indisputable, so he e'en puts it up with the rest.

³ "Vers l'âge de douze ans," says Labat, "car les Caraihes *ne sont pas fort exact dans le calcul des années,*" &c.—Hist. Générale des Voyages, vol. xv, p. 472.

miracles, we may just as well believe in one miracle⁴ as another. If the bones of Elisha gave life to the dead, I do not see why those of St. Louis, a far greater and holier man, should not heal a disease.

In the Hebrew Scriptures children long delayed and earnestly prayed for make a great figure. Isaac the second father of Israel, Joseph the saviour of his family and the ancestor of two great tribes, Samson the Hebrew Hercules, Samuel the prophet and founder of the prophetic colleges, and John the precursor of Christ, the Elisha that should come were all born after their mothers had begun to despair of children, and they were all considered as especially the gifts of God.

“And Abraham circumcised his son Isaac being eight days old,” *i. e.* on the eighth day. Why this particular day should have been set aside for this purpose, except that the number seven is one of the favourite Hebrew numbers, I know not; Lightfoot however gives the following whimsical reason for it; he says, “That as there were seven nations in the land which the Israelites were to subdue, so every child of Abraham for seven days was like the children of the seven nations; but on the eighth was to receive circumcision the pledge of his claim to that land.”⁵

Verse 13. Sarah compels Abraham to drive from his house Hagar and her son. Sarah we have already seen was a proud and shrewish woman—she now shows herself avaricious, grasping and cruel. She trembles lest her son should lose a single shekel of all his inheritance. She has a mother’s cares, but not the mother’s heart. She is the step-dame: she loves her child, and under any circumstances

⁴ By a miracle I mean: 1st. An extraordinary fact brought about by insufficient means. Thus, to raise a man from the dead is not necessarily a miracle, but so to raise him by merely pronouncing his name, is undoubtedly one. 2dly. A natural event supernaturally produced;

thus, that fire from heaven should destroy Sodom and Gomorrah is an accident natural enough, but that fire from heaven should so destroy them for their wickedness, is a miracle.

⁵ Works, Pitman’s Ed. vol. i, p. 415.

will continue to love him, because he is *her* child, but she can feel no interest in the children of another; to their faults she is inexorable, and to their excellences indifferent.

Moses has painted woman in no favourable colours. Eve brings "sin into the world and all our woe;" Lot's wife lingers near the pleasures of Sodom, and his daughters tempt him with wine and engage him in sin. Sarah is selfish; Rachel cunning and thievish, and Rebecca deceitful and treacherous. All the women Moses speaks of, he either speaks of incidentally, and then mentions nothing either to their praise or their disparagement: or he speaks of them to note some littleness or some crime of which they have been guilty.

Verses 12, 13. Michaelis thinks that this counsel of the Deity sounds somewhat harshly; but he afterwards consoles himself with the reflection that it is more in accord with our views⁶ of marriage than with those which obtained in the time of Abraham. To my poor judgment however it seems, that every man, married or not, who in our day seduces a woman, by that very act engages himself in certain duties towards her: he is bound for instance to save her from the perils of starvation, prostitution, &c.; and though he may, I care not for what reasons, have withdrawn from her society, though he may repent his crime, abhor it, yet the duties which that crime has entailed upon him he will ever earnestly fulfil; he may punish himself, but he will never punish her who has been his victim. To us therefore the conduct of Abraham—even judging it by our morality, which condemns the seduced rather than the seducer—is, to say the least of it, cruel and

⁶ Vide Michaelis, Commentary, ad h. l. According to our views of marriage, Abraham would have been living in a state of concubinage with Hagar, and that too in the very house of his wife. The first request therefore which any respectable man of our time would make to

him, would be that which the Archbishop of Paris made to Louis XV on his death-bed, to send away his Madame du Barry. And let him turn her away, but not into the wide world—to starve. With Abraham's conduct compare the wiser law of Menu, c. ix, § 122-3.

unjustifiable. But when we remember, that both in her own eyes and in the eyes of those among whom she lived Hagar was innocent of all crime: that she had shared Abraham's bed at Sarah's instigation and for Sarah's sake: that she was the mother of one of Abraham's children, and was in fact Abraham's wife: then Abraham's conduct appears criminal indeed, and to attribute it to the counsel of the Deity is nothing short of blasphemy.

But would his cotemporaries have judged thus harshly of Abraham? Yes, if they ventured to judge him at all, or why is a command of the Deity put forth as his excuse, his warranty, his justification? But how suppose that God would command a crime? Superstitious man is ruled by his fears and not by his reason; his God is not a moral, but a powerful Being, a Being arbitrary and *above all law*, rather than one in whom all law resides; a Being in a word of whom he can believe any absurdity properly authenticated—it is the safer course—and whose commands therefore he will hasten to obey whether they be to thrust out a wife or to desolate an empire.⁷

But again, as much of our own conduct, and particularly our conduct in reference to children, is determined by our expectation of certain results; does not this revelation which with a command of the Elohim unites a promise, and which in fact amounts but to this, "Send your child away from you, it will be the better for him;" does it not, because it lays open the future to Abraham, justify him in his treatment of Ishmael? And as it induces him to subsume his own affections to Ishmael's welfare, does it not give a moral character to that treatment? And is it not therefore the revelation of a moral and merciful Deity, and one to which the most tender-conscienced parent would even in our day most gladly submit? To this view of the case I must object.

1. The text. It is but necessary to glance over the

⁷ *e. g.* The atrocities of the crusades against the Saracens, Vaudois, Albigeois, Paterins, &c.; were all sanctioned by the command of God?

See Sismondi's *Hist. des Français*, part iii; and *Gesta Dei per Francos*, of which Gibbon says, "some critics propose to read, *Gesta DIABOLI*."

address of the Elohim, to perceive that His counsel is not given for the sake of Ishmael, but for the sake of Isaac and of Sarah, and that His promise in favour of Ishmael is a mere afterthought, and I might have supposed intended as a salve for Abraham's grief, but that it does not extend to Hagar.

2. The manner in which Abraham executes the counsel of the Elohim. Abraham "has sheep and oxen and he-asses, and men-servants and maid-servants and she-asses and camels," and yet with all his wealth he can spare not one servant to tend upon *his wife* and child, and no beast of burden to carry them and their property: empty-handed they came into his tent, and empty-handed—nay, with a loaf of bread and a bottle of water—he drives them out into the wilderness to starve. Does this indicate a father who in pure love to his son sends him into the world?⁶

But Abraham, it will be answered, had faith in God. It is doubtless very pious of us who are rich and happy to speak of God's providence to the cold and starving poor, and to bid them put their trust in Him who clotheth the lily and feedeth the raven: but I more honour the man who in *their* troubles assists his fellows, and in *his own* lifts up his heart to God. Truly Abraham shows a faith that will remove mountains when Hagar and Ishmael are in question; but where was his faith when he feared lest Sarah's beauty should jeopardy his life?

But is it credible that Abraham, who so loved Ishmael that he would gladly have made him his heir, should now forge a revelation in order to get rid of him? Not credible most assuredly, as little credible, as that counsel such as these verses give should have come from God. I believe,

⁶ Michaelis says indeed: "Man muss diesen Vers (14) nicht so verstehen, als beschrieb er die Ausstattung Ismael's: denn das ist wohl unbegreiflich dass ein so bemittelter Vater den Sohn den er zärtlich liebte, mit Brod &c. abgefunden haben sollte. Hier ist blos

von den Lebensmitteln die Rede. ...und wenn Hagar auch sonst noch so viel Kostbarkeiten, &c..... bey sich gehabt hätte, so gehörte das doch nichts zu unserer Geschichte," &c. Incomprehensible I grant it; but read the last chapter of Ezra.

for I take the story as I find it, that Abraham acted under some delusion, the influence of some dream, or some sudden impulse, which whatever might be its purport, he ever at any sacrifice instantly and blindly obeyed.

But Abraham is very old, he cannot live much longer, and should he die suddenly may not Ishmael seize upon the inheritance of Isaac, and thus thwart the designs of Providence? Is he not justified therefore in guarding against so untoward an event? It is very considerate truly of Abraham thus to take Providence under his immediate protection, and quite right of him doubtless to use whatever precautions he may think necessary to secure the due execution of his last will and testament—but must he therefore send out Hagar and Ishmael into the desert to starve? Let us never forget that it is one of the first principles of our morality, that we “must not do evil that good may come.”

“In Isaac shall thy seed be called; and also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation because he is thy seed.” Isaac, the son of Sarah the free woman, is the father of the Hebrews; Ishmael, the son of Hagar the bondwoman, is one among the recognised ancestors of the Arabians. Of these people *the one*, as the favourite children, received the rich and fertile Canaan as their portion, while to *the other* fell the barren deserts of Asia. The *former* however inherited their patrimony to little purpose. Their annals tell us only of their reverses in war and internal divisions, of their weakness, and of the oppression they endured either from their own sovereigns or from those of their neighbours to whom they were tributary. Their existence during their long occupation of Palestine scarce one gleam of freedom ever warmed. And since their last captivity and dispersion they cannot be said to have lived, but rather to have suffered one prolonged martyrdom,—during which this praise at least is theirs, that whatever may have been the persecutions heaped upon them,

⁹ Vide Sale's Koran, Prelim. Dis. § i, p. 11.

they have still loudly professed the faith, and still stoutly maintained the characteristics, of their race. The *latter* on the other hand to this day possess their inheritance, and to this day they are as they have ever been, a poor but an independent people, to whom their independence, individual and political, is as the air they breathe. Indeed, *unlike the Hebrews*, they may be ranked among the *oppressors*, rather than among the *oppressed*, of mankind; though, *like them*, they continue the same and unmoved in the midst of change, for they still cling to the simple customs and pursue the wandering life of their fathers. These brother people then, so different in their fates and characters, resemble each other in the obstinacy of their nationality, and still more strangely in the sort of influence which they have severally exercised over Humanity. For, though no inventions in the arts of either peace or war, and no great names of warriors, statesmen, or philosophers, illustrate their existence,¹ and connect it with ours, yet have they each in their long career produced one great prophet—the Hebrews Christ, the Arabians Mahomet—and that prophet the founder of a new religion, and of one which still subsists and still occupies the attention and fills the heart of a large portion of the civilized world.

But to Isaac belong the promise and the blessing. Mahomet, the great prophet and chief glory of Ishmael, is but a disciple and successor of Moses the Hebrew. Like Moses, Mahomet found himself one of a race of men, who, though they owed to a common origin, had no common bond of union, and like Moses by the aid of a religion he formed of this crowd of people² a nation. From Moses

¹ I speak of the Jews before the dispersion, of the Arabians before Mahomet. Reiske, the great Arabic scholar, in a letter to Michaelis, says of them: "Ne unicus quidem liber Arabicus mihi notus est, sæculo post Christum octo antiquior; poemata eorumque collectione; quales Aevanos appellat, excipio."

—Michaelis, Briefwech. vol. i, p. 44.

² The reconciliation and union of the Arab tribes is considered by the Mahommetans among the strongest proofs of the divinity of their prophet's mission. To that reconciliation Mahomet alludes.—Koran, vol. i, c. viii, of Sale's translation.

Mahomet borrowed his creation, and origin of sin³ and the early history of mankind. Following in the steps of Moses, he built up his creed on the unity of the Godhead; and like Moses he rather affirmed that unity than gave such a conception of his Allah as made a plurality of Gods something altogether absurd and impossible. From Moses he obtained his laws, and from the later Jews the greater number of his religious doctrines; he thus appropriated their angels, their scriptures, their prophets, their resurrection, and their day of judgment.⁴

But Moses and Mahomet looked at religion from different points of view, and saw its end and objects in different lights. Moses, as the foster son of the Pharaohs, as learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, claimed a distinguished station among his people, and was early called upon to act as their counsellor, leader and legislator. Invested with this high authority, he announced to them their future religion, and announced it to them as a state religion, and as framed for a particular state and for that state only. He gave this religion moreover a creed so narrow and negative, he

³ Mahomet, however, thus accounts for the fall and sin of Eblis (Satan). "We, Allah, created you (man), and afterwards formed you; and then said unto the angels, Worship Adam; and they all worshipped him, except Eblis, who was not one of those who worshipped. God said unto him, What hindered thee from worshipping Adam, since I had commanded thee? He answered, I am more excellent than he; thou hast created me of fire, and hast created him of clay. God said, Get thee down from Paradise, for it is not fit that thou behave thyself proudly therein; get thee hence; thou shalt be one of the contemptible. He answered, Give me respite unto the day of judgment. God said, Verily thou shalt be one of those who are respited. The Devil said, Because thou hast deprived me I will lay wait for men

in thy strait way; then will I come upon them from before and from behind, and from their right hands and from their left; and thou shalt not find the greater part of them thankful. God said unto him, Get thee hence, despised and driven far away; verily, whoever of them shall follow thee, I will surely fill hell with you all."—Id. chap. vii, p. 174. This tale, which has a *naïveté* about it wanting to the Koran in general, seems to me quite out of character with the whole scope of the Mahomedan doctrine and religion. Mahomet was earnest and bitter against idolatry, and yet he makes Allah to punish Eblis because Eblis refused to be an idolator.

⁴ See Sale's Prelim. Dis. § iv, and compare with the Mahomedan doctrines those of the later Jews, described in Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, liv. iv, c. i, ix, xxxii.

limited it to objects so purely temporal, he crowded it with observances so entirely ceremonial or national, that we find it difficult to determine whether Moses merely established this religion in order that by a community of worship he might induce in the tribe-divided Israelites that community of sentiment which would constitute them a nation; or, whether he only roused them to a sense of their national dignity in the hope that they might then more faithfully perform the duties of priests and servants of Jehovah. In other words, we hesitate to decide whether in the mind of Moses the state was subsumed to the purposes of religion, or religion to purposes of state.

Of Mahomet, we can have no such doubts. Originally a servant, Mahomet⁵ was only accidentally raised to wealth by a happy marriage; uneducated and "illiterate,"⁶ he made no figure and was of no rank among his countrymen; the influence he possessed with them, whatever it may have been, was consequently not the influence of a public man, that influence which acts upon masses; but the influence of an individual,—that merely personal influence which acts upon individuals. To individuals therefore Mahomet was compelled to proclaim his mission, and to preach his doctrines; his converts, wherever he could find them, he gathered round him; he formed them into a community of which he was the head, and upon that community he laid it as an imperative duty to extend itself until it should embrace and in him unite together the whole earth. Mahomet then was a prophet only, Moses both statesman and prophet, and perhaps more statesman than prophet; Moses legislated for a people and founded a state and a religion; Mahomet addressed mankind and founded a brotherhood of which religion was the tie: the one through the state worked upon the individual, the other through the individual on the state; the former limited his legislation to, and provided for its maintenance among, his own people

⁵ See Sale's Prelim. Dis. § ii, for this account of Mahomet. shall follow the apostle, *the illiterate prophet*," &c.—vol. i, c. vii, p.

⁶ He so styles himself: "Who 197, and elsewhere.

only; the latter knew no people, no country, and no limit to the spread of his doctrines and the number of his followers, whom he commanded, by force⁷ or persuasion, still to proselytize. In the absence then of all spiritual energy, of any moral aims, *this* established a religion which must live in an active, *that*, one which can only display itself in a resisting, passive, fanaticism.

Again Mahomet,—and let me beware that I rank not among those who have ever a mock, and a scourge, and a crown of thorns, for him who devotes himself to another cause than that to which they have vowed allegiance,—Mahomet was a man of sanguine temperament, with a keen relish for sensual pleasure; but of a religious, meditative, and imaginative mind, an earnest and enthusiastic disposition, and a large and noble heart. His apprehension seems to have been quick, his memory ready and tenacious, but his understanding was acute and material and practical rather than theoretical and comprehensive.

Mahomet was born and brought up among the Heathen Koreish; from their gross and sensual idolatry he however appears early to have turned away, and to have sought in other religions⁸ then professed in Arabia that rest for his soul which his ancestral creed could not afford; and he sought in vain. From the Jews Mahomet heard of God—the Creator of heaven and earth, the Almighty, the One; he studied their law; he was captivated by the simplicity of their creed⁹ and their unity of worship; but their con-

⁷ Thus, “God hath purchased the true believers, their souls, and their substance, promising them the enjoyment of Paradise *on condition that they fight for the cause of God.*” (vol. i, c. ix, p. 241); and “When ye encounter the unbelievers *strike off their heads*, until ye make great slaughter of them.”—Vol. ii, c. xlvii, p. 364, &c.

⁸ Sale adds to the Jewish and Christian faiths with which Mahomet was acquainted, the Magian. As, however, I find nothing in the

Koran, belonging to the Zend religion exclusively, nothing which had not already found its way into the Jewish creed, I do not think it necessary to suppose that Mahomet had directed his attention to that religion particularly.

⁹ Of the importance which Mahomet attached to a simplicity of creed, the praise he gives the Koran is a proof; in it “there is no crookedness,” “it is a straight rule,” “the perspicuous book.”—vol. ii, c. xviii, p. 117; c. xxxix, &c.

temptuous exclusiveness, their indifference to the fate of others, their narrow selfishness, repelled him; he instinctively felt that the God of the universe was the God of mankind, and not of a people; and by their own confession he knew that their law, to which they clung, was but a lesson preparatory to another and a purer revelation;—for that revelation then Mahomet asked, and that revelation the Christians boasted that they had received. They spoke to him of God the universal Father, and of their great prophet who had preached, not vain ceremonies, but peace and good will to man. He inquired into their views: and now sect rose up to battle against sect, and by their contradictory doctrines, their nice and subtle distinctions, they confounded his simple mind. He looked into their practice,—and pictures and images of worshipped saints and angels reminded him of the rejected faith of the Koreish. Christianity was no religion for him.

Mahomet retired into himself. One great truth—the unity of the Godhead—had struck deep root into his soul: that truth he dwelt upon, cultivated and developed, till it at length embraced and occupied his whole being. To the one God he devoted his thoughts, his energies, his life; and the one God—for none shared his faith—in solitude he worshipped. In solitude too he no doubt often mourned over the lost and abject condition of his idolatrous kinsfolk and countrymen, and often remembered the great prophets who in olden times had so fearlessly preached God to their heathen neighbours; and then doubts of his own ability, or a fear of injuring the cause for which he would have offered himself a willing martyr, alone deterred him from imitating their example. But daily that example grew upon him, and daily took a stronger hold of his imagination; daily he was more occupied with this his great duty, less with himself; and he now only waited some call, some inspiration—when at length he heard, or seemed to hear, the voice “of the angel of revelations”¹ proclaiming him the ambassador and apostle of the Most High.

¹ Gabriel. See note 9 to chap. ii appearance of Gabriel, ordaining of Sale's Koran, p. 18. This first Mahomet to his high mission, is

But Mahomet was a man of a material and sensuous mind, and belonged to a material and sensuous age and nation; and his religion, like himself, his nation, and his age, is material and sensuous. His Deity, for instance, is ever great by his visible works, by his earth and his heavens, and by his innumerable creatures and his power over their fortunes and happiness; he is—though it must be allowed that wisdom, mercy, goodness, are not sparingly attributed to him—a *mere omnipotence*.² And because he is infinitely raised above all other things, because he is accountable to none for his acts, he is a *merely arbitrary omnipotence*; i. e. mere brute, uncivilized, uneducated man, with the power of a God, or a merely material God. And as a material God he is shown to us, either seated on his throne above the heavens with the great book of his decrees ever before him, or descending borne up by angels to judge the gathered nations.³ As a material God too he creates nothing but matter; his nearest attendants are therefore material beings,⁴ and his ministers winged palpable⁵ forms, who wait upon us and watch us and in a good legible hand write down every our minutest action, and thus prepare the tablets which must at the last great day decide our fates. And as a material God he has also set apart for us a local paradise, where—and whose soul sickens not at the prospect of such an eternity?—black-eyed houris, and cool gardens, and sealed wines, and delicious fruits, and never-failing appetites, await the believer, made merry

from Abulfeda (de Vita Moh. c. vii, p. 14, 15) quoted by Schröckh, Christlic. Kirchengesch. vol. xix, p. 329, 330.

² I mean that in the Koran the omnipotence of the Deity is so prominently put forward, that all his other attributes are swallowed up in it.

³ Vide chap. lxix, &c. I call the Allah of Mahomet material, because he is not spirit. Vide observations on chap. i, 26.

⁴ Thus Eblis, "Thou hast created

me of fire, and hast created him of clay."—Chap. xxxviii.

⁵ "Praise be to God, who maketh the angels his messengers, furnished with two, three, and four pair of wings." (c. xxxv.) "When the two angels deputed to take an account of a man's behaviour take an account thereof; one sitteth on the right hand, and the other on the left: he uttereth not a word but there is with him a watcher ready to note it."—Chapter L, &c.

by the sight of a *Divina Commedia* indeed—the devouring flames and intolerable tortures of hell.⁶

Again, because Allah is *omnipotence*, and because change is a characteristic of weakness, the will and decrees of Allah are necessarily fixed and unalterable; but because Allah is *an arbitrary omnipotence*, his will as addressed to man wears the form of a command⁷ rather than of a law; i. e. appears as something to be obeyed, not examined; as something which has its reason in its origin, and not in itself. Hence a morality of mere regulations,⁸ devoid of all spiritual life and freedom, and a providence which as it is reduced to a destiny stays all intellectual inquiry and renders all human effort unavailing, and thus induces a hopeless content, or a patient endurance.

But Allah is also a beneficent omnipotence; he desires the good of his creatures, and to insure it he has at various times and through his prophets revealed to them his will and purposes. Of these prophets, Mahomet appears as the last and the crown. To him Allah delivered not, as to others, fragments of his law, but the eternal book of the divine decrees—the Koran, which he bid him publish to mankind. To this book then Mahomet ever points as an incontrovertible evidence of his mission. He boasts the music of its sentences, and the majestic beauty of its style; and he is awed by the sublimity of its doctrines, and the simple yet unfathomable wisdom of its precepts. To its study he calls upon his followers to devote themselves; and after a lapse of centuries the Koran is still for a large portion of the civilized world literally the Book of Life, the well-spring of faith, whence man draws advice in

⁶ Verily the righteous shall dwell among delights: seated on couches they shall *behold* objects of pleasure; thou shalt see in their faces the brightness of joy. They shall be given to drink of pure wine sealed.....One day the true believers in their turn shall laugh the infidels to scorn; lying on couches, they shall look down upon them in

hell.”—Chap. lxxxiv. See the last chapters of the Koran generally.

⁷ Hence the contradictions which are occasionally met with in the Koran. Hence too, that command which occasioned the fall of Eblis, &c.—Note ³, p. 438, *supra*.

⁸ See Koran, *passim*, c. ii, p. 30; c. iii, p. 75; c. vii, p. 170; c. viii, p. 206; and c. xlii, p. 341, &c.

perplexity, comfort in tribulation, and hope and peace in death. For the Mahommedan such is the Koran.

I have read the sacred books of several other people: much in them I have met with which I judged trivial and even absurd; but in all I have here and there been stayed by some sentence full of light and meaning, some cry heaved up from the depths of the human heart to which the human heart responded, some truth so all-embracing so inexhaustible, that I wonder not man received it as divine. The Koran alone I have toiled through, and found all barren. I have been wearied by its want of order and method, by its frequent repetitions, and its disputatious dogmatism. Its terrible denunciations against unbelievers, and the joy with which it seems to utter them, disgust me: and I cannot admire those much-prized descriptions of a Deity who is merely material and sensual, human mighty.⁹ It is not to power that I would pay

⁹ Though my indifference to the alledged beauties of the Koran—beauties which millions of men assert are such that they “are inimitable by human pen, and can have none but a divine origin”—evidences only either that I do not rightly apprehend the book, or that my taste is sectarian or national rather than catholic; yet I think it right to annex one or two celebrated passages, in order that every one may judge for himself. The first relates to the Deity, and is regarded as the sublimest piece in the Koran: “God! there is no God but He; the Living, the Self-subsisting! neither slumber nor sleep seizeth Him; to Him belongeth whatever is in heaven and earth. Who is he can intercede with Him but through His good pleasure? He knoweth that which is past, and that which is to come unto them, and they shall not comprehend any of His knowledge, but so far as He pleaseth. His throne is extended over heaven and

earth, and the preservation of both is no burden to Him. He is the High, the Mighty.” (c. ii, p. 45-6.) The second is the passage, the beauty of which is said so to have struck the poet Labid, then an idolater (vide Sale’s Prelim. Dis. p. 72), that he immediately professed himself a disciple of Mahomet, “declaring that such words could proceed from an inspired person only”: “There are some who say, We believe in God and the last day; but they deceive themselves only, and are not sensible thereof. These are the men who have purchased error at the price of true direction; but their traffic has not been gainful, neither have they been rightly directed. They are like unto one who kindleth a fire, and when it hath enlightened all around him, God taketh away their light and leaveth them in darkness; they shall not see; they are deaf, dumb, and blind, therefore they will not repent. Or like a stormy cloud from heaven fraught with darkness,

adoration, or I must worship Eblis, but to God, in whom all perfection dwells, and through whom alone we apprehend (though so dimly) all truth and excellence. And such a God Allah is not.

Verses 14-21. At this time Ishmael must have been a youth from thirteen to sixteen years of age, and yet the whole tenor of the narrative would lead one to suppose that he was a mere child, almost unable to take care of himself, and certainly incapable of bearing either fatigue or privation.

Verses 22-32. Abimelech, recognising the high favour in which Abraham stands with God, and observing the rapid increase of his wealth and power, desires to enter into a treaty with him, by which, in consideration of certain services already rendered, Abraham shall promise to contrive nothing against the land of Abimelech or against Abimelech himself and his descendants, for two generations. Before however Abraham binds himself to these conditions, he requires Abimelech to restore "a well of water,"—even in our day one of the most frequent causes of war¹ in these countries—of which he complains that Abimelech's servants had deprived him. Abimelech pleads his ignorance of the whole matter, and disavows the conduct of his servants, and then by a contract, of which the acceptance of seven ewe lambs is the seal, acknowledges the right of Abraham to the well.

Abimelech acknowledges Abraham's title to the well:

thunder, and lightning, they put their fingers in their ears, because of the noise of the thunder, for fear of death. God encompasseth the infidels; the lightning wanteth but little of taking away their sight; so often as it enlighteneth them they walk therein, but when darkness cometh on them, they stand still, and if God so pleased, he would certainly deprive them of

their hearing and their sight." (Vol. i, c. ii, p. 4.) These passages are above the average; but even these no way induce me to revoke, but rather confirm, my opinion.

¹ "The most frequent cause of war among the Arabians is a jealousy about watering-places and pasture-grounds." — Burckhardt's *Notes on the Bedouins*, vol. i, p. 146.

he sets up no counter-claim of his own founded on a previous proprietorship of the soil; he seems to consider, that that which labour alone had made of value was honestly the property of him who had employed that labour upon it; or he regards that permission which he gave to Abraham—"My land is before thee, dwell where it pleaseth thee,"—as a permission to settle in any tract of country which was yet unoccupied.

In these early times it would appear that property in land was of two kinds. The land which immediately surrounded the walls of any city was probably originally distributed among its citizens, and, unless it was exchanged for something else, descended like any other property, as houses, goods, and chattels, from the father to his children. It was, both from the conveniency of its situation and the facility with which its crops might be protected and gathered in, generally employed in tillage—it was the granary of the city. The rest of the country, a large tract (for in these days the population was thin, the cities few and far between) was considered as a sort of common, on which the citizens had the right of pasturage: and this right, as there was room enough and to spare, they seem at times to have extended to strangers. But as in the course of years the same family again and again returned to the same spot, and as it there from time to time erected conveniences for its herdsmen and cattle and dug wells and planted groves, it began to look on the tract it usually occupied as its country, to claim a prescriptive right to it, and to regard any attempt to settle upon it as an intrusion which was to be repelled. In this state of things, where every body arrogates a right which no one acknowledges, i. e. where he who invades claims an equal right with, and denies the exclusive right of, him who defends, such quarrels as these between the herdsmen of Abraham and Abimelech must often take place, though they will rarely be pacified by so equitable a decision as that of Abimelech's, a decision which in fact recognises a new order of things, by admitting that occupancy constitutes a title to property.

“Wherefore he called that place Beersheba.” This name has two significations, and both of them applicable to the spot in which this transaction took place;—it signifies either the “well of the oath,” or the “well of the Seven.”²

Verse 33. Abraham plants a grove in Beersheba, and calls there on the name of the Lord. The law³ forbids the Hebrews to “plant a grove or any trees near unto the altar of the Lord.” But why, we would naturally inquire, was that prohibited to the descendants which was permitted to the ancestor? Moses perhaps desired to distinguish the service offered to his God from that which was offered to the neighbouring idols, particularly Baal.⁴ Perhaps too he feared to call around the altar of God a crowd of idle devotees, who would come there not to worship but to enjoy themselves, and whom the cool and pleasant shade would soon allure to all sorts of licentious freedoms. And perhaps too, as we have before observed, he conceived that if altars were allowed to be raised and groves planted any where, the unity of God would be lost, and a separate and distinct God would possess every shrine.

But why should Abraham build altars and plant groves? Wherever Abraham’s tent was, there was Jehovah; and whatever altars he raised, he raised them still to one and the same Deity. But when Abraham’s descendants had grown into a people, though Jehovah might accompany them as a people in their wanderings, yet as He could not rest in every tent, He chose an ark for His dwelling, and afterwards a temple, whence He overlooked if He could not occupy the whole land.

“And Abraham called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God,” *i. e.* there invoked or prayed to the everlasting God.⁵ But while we give the probable, and

² Marginal reading, and Michaelis’ Commentary, ad h. l.

³ Deut. xvi, 21.

⁴ Judges iii, 7; 2 Kings xvii, 16.

⁵ “Redundare dicitur nomen in phrasi, nomen Dei, *h. e.* ipse Deus.

.....Alii hypallagen hic ponunt; nomen Dei, *h. e.* Deus nominis seu nominatissimus et laudatissimus.... Sic invocare nomen Domini, diligere nomen Domini, psallere nomini Dei, est verum Deum invocare,

perhaps original, meaning of this form of expression, we must not omit to note a superstition, seemingly connected with it, which, though possibly borrowed from some neighbouring nation, obtained among the Jews. With them then the name of the Deity was not like any other word, a mere sound to which common consent had given a particular signification, but it was a word which partook of the nature and power of the Being it was employed to denote. It was

i. A holy word, consecrated, and applicable only, to God:⁶ a word not be lightly uttered, and not to be uttered by profane lips or to profane ears;⁷ indeed it could be pronounced only in God's temple, on the day of purification, when the high priest entered into the holy of holies.⁸ It was,

ii. A word of power. It is presented to us as the great centre round which all things pressed, on which all things depended: it controlled all spirits, and had sovereign authority over all creatures, it ruled in fact the universe.⁹

diligere, laudare."—Glassii Philol. Sacra, tom. i, lib. iii, p. 671.

⁶ Exodus xx. 7. In the Parsee faith, among the sins enumerated in the Patet de l'Iran, is this: "Pour avoir donné le nom des Izeds aux Dews, et celui des Dews aux Izeds."—Zend. vol. ii, p. 46. Is not this very nearly the Jewish law of blasphemy, according to Maimonides? "Quicumque confitetur idolorum cultum verum esse, etiamsi ipse idolis non servat, certe ille abnegat et blasphemat nomen honorabile ac formidabile."—De Idolat. chap. ii, § 9, Voss's translation; and see, for traces of the same superstition, Koran, vol. i, chap. vii, pp. 201-202, Sale's translation.

⁷ Philo regards Jehovah as a name: ὁ μονοῖς τοῖς ὤτα καὶ γλωτταν σοφία κεκαθαρμένοις θεμερῶς ἀκούειν καὶ λέγειν ἐν ἁγίοις· ἀλλὰ δ' οὐδενὶ το παραπαν οὐδαμον, &c. "Quod solis aures linguamque

sapientia purgatis fas est audire nominareque in sacris, præterea nemini," &c.—De Vita Mosis, lib. iii, p. 684, Paris edit. Josephus also narrates, that when Moses asks the name of God—'Ο θεος σημαίνει την ἐαυτου προσηγοριαν, ου προτερον εις ανθρωπους παρελθουσιν· περι ης ου μοι θεμερῶς ειπειν. "Tum Deus nomen ei enunciat hominibus non antea patet factum, quod effari mihi nefas est."—Antiq. vol. ii, c. xii, § iv. Among the Egyptians, this superstition seems to have obtained. Vide Herod. lib. ii, § 61, 170, &c.

⁸ "La loi défend de prononcer ce grand nom, excepté dans son temple, lorsque le souverain sacrificateur entrait dans le lieu très-saint au jour des propitiations."—Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, lib. iii, chap. xiii, § v.

⁹ The cabbalists of the name Jehovah. "Ce nom a une autorité souveraine sur toutes les créatures.

And it was

III. A word which could be replaced by no other word ; it was therefore untranslateable and unchangeable ; his name was as much a part of the Deity as his attributes, and a knowledge of it was considered essential to his true service.¹

From the reverence with which the divine names were regarded, we may deduce several superstitions once current, and the traces of which are still to be found among us. And

1st. Because the names given to the Deity were names revealed by the Deity himself, and revealed only after long ages ; and as they were moreover names seldom pronounced ; men concluded that "the gods delighted in privacy, in the concealment of their names."²

2ndly. Because a certain power was attached to the revealed names of the Deity, a similar power was naturally enough extended to all revealed words, independently of their meaning, which were used in the divine service.

C'est lui qui gouverne le monde par sa puissance.....Le nom de Jéhovah influe sur les autres noms et surnoms ; il se fait une impression de ces noms sur les princes qui en dépendent, et des princes sur les nations qui vivent sous leur protection."—Basnage, *id. ib.* In the Zend creed also, Ormuzd thus addresses Zoroaster : "Si vous voulez rendre malades et briser les Dews hommes, les magiciens, &c. prononcez et recitez mon nom dans toute son étendue," &c.—Ieschd d'Ormuzd, *Zend. vol. ii, p. 146-8.* In the Brahminical faith, similarly, "The trilateral monosyllable is an emblem of the Supreme..... All rites ordained in the Veda... pass away, but that which passes not away is the syllable Om, the symbol of God," &c.—Menu, *vol. ii, p. 84-85* ; and see *supra*, chap. i, p. 140, note.

¹ Of the names of God, Agrippa (*de Occul. Phil. lib. iii, chap. xi,*

p. 288-9, fol. 1533) : "Hæc sunt occulta, abscondita de quibus diffcillimum est adferre judicium et completum tradere scientiam, nec in ullâ aliâ linguâ quam in Hebraicâ intelligi et doceri possunt," &c. And again : "There are certain names, says Psellus, among all nations, delivered to them by God, which have an unspeakable power in divine rites ; change not these into the Greek dialect, for they are then ineffectual."—Stanley, *Hist. Phil. part xix, p. 47* ; Cory's *Ancient Fragments, Oracles of Zoroaster, No. 155, p. 271* ; and see Jamblichus de *Mysteriis*, chap. v, § viii. And Basnage, *ut sup.* "On voit par-là qu'il est de la dernière importance de savoir la signification des noms que Dieu porte, puisque en s'y trompant on se damneroit au lieu de se sauver."

² Asiatic Researches, *vol. viii, p. 425* ; Judges *xiii. 18* ; and note, *supra*, from Agrippa.

Hence the moral and even sometimes physical power supposed to reside in certain holy books, which men are ordained to read or to copy,³ and in formulary prayers, which *among some people* to be efficacious must be recited, while *among others* it is sufficient to swallow them in pills, or roll them round on cylinders.⁴

3rdly. Because on account of age or for some other reason these revealed words became generally unintelligible, men began

1st. To look on obscurity, unintelligibleness, as among the characteristics of the divine language. Because God spake darkly, they heard God's voice in unknown tongues, in the cries of madmen and the babblings of idiots. They went at length so far as to hold idiocy as something sacred, and its prayers as more especially efficacious.⁵ And

2ndly. To give over the interpretation of the divine language to a particular set of men, priests, who made that language their study, and a knowledge of it essential to the exercise of the priestly office, and who thus raised themselves to the dignity of a learned and separate class, which while it pur-

³ Such books are the Vedas, the Zendavesta, the Chinese Kings (Mém. Chin. vol. ix, p. 350), the Dordshe-Dshodbo of the Kalmucks, of which books Pallas tells us, "Deren Kraft auch ruchlose Seelen von denen verdienten Strafen befreit, wenn sie dieselben in ihrem Leben fleissig gelesen oder abgeschrieben oder auch bey sich getragen haben." — Reise, vol. i, p. 349.

⁴ They may be recited without any attention to, or knowledge of, their contents, as when they are recited in a language with which one is unacquainted,—as in the Romish liturgy. Schlosser says, "that the prayers of the Vedas may be read indifferently, backwards or forwards;—in the words is the magic power."—Indien, § ii ;

Gesch. d. Alt. Welt. vol. i. Menu says: "This holy Scripture, the Veda, is a sure refuge even for those who understand not its meaning."—vol. vi, p. 84. See also Asiatic Researches, vol. viii, p. 389. The pills and cylinders, which are certainly an improvement on this sort of formulary service, are used by the Kalmucks.—Pallas, Reise, vol. i, p. 357.

⁵ Idiocy is held sacred throughout the East. In Africa, at Loango, "Les Albinos," according to De Pauw, "font la prière devant le roi; cette mode si choquante de faire reciter les prières par des imbécilles vient de l'opinion qu'on a de leur sainteté." — Américains, vol. ii, p. 20. A modification of this superstition existed also in Greece.

sued all plans for its own aggrandisement, at the same time gave a certain development and consistency to the doctrines it professed to make known.⁶

In this chapter, verse 1 and verses 33, 34, bear the name of Jehovah.

Verse 1, "And the Lord visited Sarah as he had said," &c. declares the fulfilment of the promise made by Jehovah in c. xviii. "I will certainly return unto thee, and Sarah shall have a son."

Verses 33, 34, Eichhorn⁷ regards as a supplement to the history of Abraham's sojourn among the Philistines. Is not however verse 33 one of those verses which identify Jehovah with the Elohim, which make of them one and the same being? a sort of verse which, even supposing Eichhorn's view of the two original narratives to be correct, must occasionally have been met with, if not in the Elohim, at least in the Jehovah narrative?

The remainder of the chapter is written with the name Elohim, and refers to, and continues the previous Elohim narrative. Thus the second verse relates the accomplishment of the Elohim promise in chapter xvii, 21; while

⁶ The sacred language of India is the Sanscrit, known to the Brahmins; of the Parsees, the Zend, known to the Mobeds; of the Jews, the Hebrew, known to the Rabbis. Besides these people, the Egyptians also had a sacred alphabet and language known to the priests.—Warburton, *Divine Legation*, vol. ii, p. 97, 132; Diod. lib. i, § 81; Herod. lib. ii, c. 36. In Peru, the Yncas had a language peculiar to themselves, though already forgotten in the time of Garcilasso de Vega, who wrote but half a century after the destruction of their empire.—Hist. des Yncas, liv. vii. At the present day the Abyssinians have a sacred language, in which the holy books are alone written. (Bruce, vol. i,

p. 425.) This language is Geez, a dialect of the Semitic; see art. *Æthiopen* and *Amarische Sprache*, by Gesenius, in Ersh and Gruber. And in Otaheite, according to Cook, the language used in devotional exercises is different from that which is used in common. (Kerr's *Collection of Voyages*, vol. xiv, p. 59.) The religious language seems, however, sometimes to have been retained, though its meaning was lost, as in Samothrace.—Diod. Sic. lib. v, § 47; and in two towns of Lydia; (Pausanias, lib. v, 27, § 3); I presume because the priesthood here were elected from among the people, not educated and ordained for the office.

⁷ *Einleitung in d. alt. Test.* § 416.

verses 3, 4, 5, which tell us of the name which Abraham gave to his new-born son, and of that son's circumcision when he was eight days old, and of the age of Abraham at that same birth, stand in connexion respectively with verses 19, 12, and 24 of chapter xvii. From verse 22 to 32 inclusive is a continuation of chapter xx, and the covenant which it makes known is perhaps the consequence of the permission which Abimelech gave to Abraham, to dwell where it pleased him (chapter xx, 15).

In this Elohim narrative we find for the first time, the etymology of the name of a place, Beersheba; and also a play upon the name of Isaac (verse 6). Eichhorn says that the etymology here given to the name of Isaac is different from that presented by the Jehovah author, (chap. xviii, 15).

We may observe also that the events relating to Hagar in this chapter very nearly resemble those already narrated by Jehovah in chapter xvi. Are the two narratives but different traditions of one and the same event?

With the banishment of Hagar and Ishmael from the house of Abraham we may connect the conduct of the Israelites, on their return from captivity, to their strange wives and such as were born of them. They put them away by the counsel of Ezra, and did it according to the law (Ezra x, 3).

Of the appearance of the Deity in this chapter we may remark, that it is one among the very few that occurred during the day-time, and that of those few two occurred to Hagar.

CHAPTER XX.

GENESIS xxii, 1-24.

Verses 1-14. In the time of Moses, child-sacrifices, as we may gather from the books of the law,¹ were frequent in both Canaan and the neighbouring states. How did they originate there? The Phœnician historian, Sanchoniatho, speaks of them as sanctioned by the highest antiquity, and he cites the example² of the first Phœnician king, the deified Chronos, who to save his country from ruin offered up his only son to the avenging gods. If now we attach any weight to the authority of Sanchoniatho, we must conclude with Marsham, that child sacrifices were

¹ Leviticus xx, 2-4. The Arabians in the time of Mahomet sacrificed, by burying alive, their daughters.—Prelim. Dis. to Koran.

² According to Marsham, Canon. Chron. Secul. v: "Feralis iste sacrificandi ritus Abrahami temporibus vetustior erat; Philo-Byblius, ex Sanchoniathone, ad ipsum Saturnum refert." The words of Philo, however, scarcely go so far as to attribute the origin of this rite to Saturn. They are: Εξος ην τοις παλαιοις εν ταις μεγαλαις συμφοραις των κινδυνων αντι της παντων φθορας, το ηγαπημενον των τεκνων, τους κρατουντας η πολεως η εθνους εις σφαγην επιδιδοναι λυτρον τοις τιμωροις δαιμοσι· κατεσφαττοντο δε οι διδομενοι μυστικως. Κρονος τουνον, ον οι Φοινικες Ιλ προσαγο-

ρευουσι, βασιλευων της χωρας, &c. Apud veteres mos fuit in magnis periculis, ut reges urbium aut populorum filium maxime dilectum pro calamitate publica mactandum darant, ad placandum deorum iram. Qui sic devoti sunt, ceremonia mystica jugulantur.... Enimvero Saturnus, quem Phœnices Ilum nominant, qui etiam post mortem in Saturni sidus consecratus est, cum in illo tractu regnaret, et ex Anobiet nympha indigena suscepisset filium unicum, quem propterea nominavit Jeud (quæ vox etiam num apud Phœnices unigenam significat) cumque maximum ex bellis periculum immineret, filium cultu regio ornatum ad aram a se constructam immolavit."

anterior to the age of Abraham, and that Abraham in his resolve to sacrifice Isaac probably sought to emulate the devotion of his neighbours; and we then interpret the legend thus—"God did tempt Abraham." Abraham saw the Heathens around him bringing to their altars, not merely the firstlings of their flocks and the fruits of the ground, but even their own children, and often he would ask himself, "Do I love my God less than these people their idols? Am I capable of so terrible a sacrifice?" At length he seems to hear the voice of the Elohim demanding his son, and he no longer hesitates; he cheerfully proceeds to offer him up on the appointed mountain.

But the strictly orthodox³ reject this interpretation. As the Greek grammarians found the germs of all knowledge in the poems of Homer, so they find the origin of all religious rites in the Bible. They will not moreover allow the holy men of antiquity to have been subject to any natural influences, and they therefore assail the authority of Sanchoniatho, by observing on the many centuries which separated him from Abraham, and on the uncertainty and confusion of all mythological story; or utterly disregarding all those differences of position, habits, and character, which distinguish, even to contrast, Chronos from the Jewish patriarch, they insist on the two or three points in which these national heroes resemble each other, and, adding some etymological confirmation,⁴ conclude that they were but one and the same person, and that the unconsummated sacrifice of Isaac was in fact the prototype and origin of all child-sacrifices.

I attach no great weight to the authority of Sanchoniatho, and I leave to the orthodox all the advantage they can receive from the subtleties of etymology; but when I

³ Vide Witsius, *Ægypt. lib. iii. c. vii*; Buddæus, *Hist. Vet. Test. Per. i. Sect. iii. § v. &c.*

⁴ For "Il," or "Ilus," the name the Phœnicians gave Chronos, they read "Sarmel; and they observe

that the name "Jeud," given to the only son of Il, closely resembles the epithet applied to Isaac, "*jehid*."—Genesis xxii. 2. Vide Marsham, *ut supra*; Witsius; Buddæus, Scalliger, *De Em Tem. in Frag. p. 48.*

remember that in about four centuries after the events recorded in this chapter, child-sacrifices were of frequent occurrence in Canaan, I cannot account for them by pretending the example of Abraham. For maugre all the sophistries of Satan,⁵ I cannot conceive how a sacrifice which was so silently resolved upon, and so unostentatiously prepared, and which at the moment of execution was so solemnly and strikingly prevented, should ever have induced a stranger though neighbouring people to an imitation of it—to adopt it into their rites. Surely the whole tale would have had for them quite another moral. It seems to me then, that, though the argument of Marsham is certainly not conclusive, the conjecture of his antagonists is altogether improbable.

But again, as history affords many instances of child-sacrifice, Jewish and Christian⁶ authors have remarked, that Abraham was urged by a sense of duty and obedience to the will of God, to an act which was strange both to his own habits and opinions, and to the habits and opinions of those amongst whom he had spent the greater portion of his life; while all others on the contrary gave up their children sometimes to superior force, or urged by the fear of public disgrace; and sometimes because it was the custom of the country, or from the dread of ills which the divine power could alone avert. In short, Abraham was influenced by the best and purest, and his imitators only by low and most unworthy, motives.

Can it be that the heathen is always a bad man? Is his heart never elevated to noble thought? Are sin and crime lovely in his eyes, his portion and his heritage? I will not believe that goodness and greatness are the attributes of a creed and not of Humanity. They who sacrificed their children spared not their own bodies. In the enthusiasm of their barbaric faith, they brought to their Gods what was most dear to their own souls: they loved their children much, but they loved their religion

⁵ Witsius, lib. iii, c. vii, § x.

⁶ Philo-Judæus, quoted in Witsius, ut supra.

more. They were bound to their idols by so faithful a service, that in despair of ever being able to evidence their devotion by the torture of their mere flesh, they added to it a torture of their affections, and with hearts beating fearfully they looked on while the most loved of their sons died the cruel death by fire. Their understandings were in fault, not their hearts; and they were ignorant and superstitious, not little or selfish, men. But while I vindicate the moral dignity of the heathen, I must also acknowledge, that wherever self-torment is regarded as an evidence of a religious mind and a superior excellence, the many who have recourse to it, will have recourse to it like Voltaire's faquir, "*pour la considération.*" The few great and good however are they whom we should contemplate: and they do not follow example, but give example to their fellows. Careless of opinion, they set opinion at defiance, own and but obey the law and impulse of their hearts. They act, and indifferent to the consequences of their act, they gain renown or martyrdom—and a crowd of disciples, who tread indeed in their steps, though they are not animated by their spirit. And what is this servile herd to us? Long enough we have been wearied with histories and philosophies and religions which dwell on man's weakness: it is time that we view him in his strength.

But to turn to more important matters. Is the command here attributed to the Elohim such an one as we might expect from the Deity? Any man who in our day ventured to sacrifice a child, never mind how much loved, in honour of his God, would be unanimously condemned to either a madhouse or the gallows. In Abraham's time, however, another morality, other views prevailed; the child was then the slave, the absolute property of the father, who in his turn was the slave⁷ and property of the Deity. But

⁷ Our religion reduces us to a condition of slavery when our God has the character and feelings of an individual; because he is then capricious and arbitrary, and we obey commands, not a law.

Throughout this tale, I see Abraham giving proofs of unconditional obedience, the slave-service. But where, I every moment inquire, is the faith St. Paul so highly prized?

the Elohim demands of Abraham his son's life. If now we bear in mind that over his son's life Abraham has uncontrolled power,—that he may, without infringing any known law, condemn, whenever he pleases it, that son to death,—we must allow that this right and power which he holds, and holds from his God, he may at any time be called upon to exercise at his God's request; and that whenever such a request should be made (in his eyes no improbable event) the same sense of duty which induced him to deliver Hagar and his yet unborn child into the hands of Sarah, will then compel him to yield up his much-loved son to his own and that son's Lord and Master, the Elohim. A sense of duty is the great dominating principle of Abraham's life ; it constitutes his claim to our love and admiration.

But is the command here attributed to the Elohim such an one as we might expect from the Deity? If we regard the code of morals to which we own obedience as valid and binding on us, because it declares to us the will of the Deity as made known by some especial revelation,—then because the several precepts of that code are, in so far at least as we are concerned, arbitrary, and to be obeyed, not examined, they may just as well be precepts enjoining one course of conduct as another ; and because they owe their force to a particular revelation, they may be either partially or entirely superseded by further such revelations ; and this command of the Elohim we may then view as possible, and even natural. But if on the other hand our moral code expresses the will of God as read in the principles of our nature : then, as its precepts are rational and universal, a revelation made to Humanity, they can be altered by no revelation vouchsafed to an individual, but only by one made to mankind, *i.e.* they can be altered only by a change being made in the laws of our nature : no command then, as opposed to these precepts, can be conceived as having proceeded from the Deity.

But may not such a change have taken place in the laws of our nature? If we compare the morality of any ancient

nation with that of some living people of about the same degree of civilisation, we find that in both nearly the same view of the moral obligations obtains. But we are not prepared to say that Arabs, New Zealanders and Africans, are differently constituted from ourselves,—that they are beings of another kind; on the contrary, we feel that the differences between them and us are accidental merely, and sufficiently accounted for by our more extended knowledge and habits of more continued reflection. Why then apply another principle to the Abrahamic times?

But may not the Deity for man's sake accommodate his laws to man's state? Man (so I believe Providence has ordered it, for so history and observation teach us) accommodates God's laws to himself. But if we once suppose that God's laws are *now* not merely subjectively but positively different from what they were in *the infancy of the human race*, Abraham's time for example, then if we would be consequent, we must also suppose that these laws have been continually changing as man has advanced in the career of civilisation. But because man has so advanced not in one great body,—because many and populous nations, the great crowd, have either lagged in the rear, or have never had an opportunity of escaping from the darkness of barbarism,—then these laws have in fact been changed for the benefit of the few leaders of their race, and because they are unfitted for, have been so changed to the great detriment of, the great mass of men. The supposition is absurd.

“Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac.” Josephus assures us that at this time Isaac was twenty-five years of age; while Michaelis^s argues that he must have been a mere child, or he never would have tamely submitted to be bound and laid on the altar by so aged a man as his father; he would have defended his life. Thus it is that we judge other people by ourselves. We forget that the

^s Comment. ad h. l.

morality of Abraham was the morality of his family; that those rights which he claimed over his children, his children readily allowed; and that it is therefore no way improbable that the son was as zealous in his duties as the father, as ready to obey and suffer.⁹ The argument of Michaelis then seems to me inapplicable. Besides, though I know of no "Time's Telescope" which reaches back to these distant centuries, yet when I compare the child-like weakness, the helplessness of Ishmael in the desert, with the bold bearing and the physical strength here displayed by Isaac, I must conclude that as the former was then in his thirteenth year, the latter could not now be far short of man.

"Get thee into the land of Moriah;" the upland, highland, and into that part of it, the Jews say, in which the temple of Jerusalem was built;¹ and into that part of it, say the Samaritans, on which stood their temple,² Mount Gerizim. The land Moriah seems a designation so indefinite that we may place the sacrifice just where it most suits us.

Verse 5. "I and the lad will go yonder and worship and come again to you." Voltaire³ here accuses Abraham of a falsehood: Michaelis⁴ justifies him by supposing that he went forth to sacrifice his son fully convinced that God would immediately restore that son to life, and that they would both again descend the mountain and return home together. I do not believe that Abraham had any such conviction; he obeyed the commands of his God, and asked no questions,—and if he told his servants "I and the lad go yonder and come again," he did it not with any inten-

⁹ The Koran—I do not quote it as an authority, but to show the sentiments of a people who hold paternal authority in high respect—takes the same view of the case. It makes Abraham to say to Isaac: "O my son, verily I saw in a dream that I should offer thee in sacrifice; consider therefore what thou art of opinion I should do." He answered,

"O my father, do what thou art commanded; thou shalt find me a patient person."—Vol. ii, c. xxxvii, p. 301.

¹ Vide Geographical Index, No. 111 & 330.

² Vide Clarke's Travels, vol. iv, c. vii.

³ Notes de la Génèse, ad h. c.

⁴ Comment. ad h. l.

tion to deceive them, but merely because he wished them to understand that they were to await his return.

Verse 14. "And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-Jireh." Here Jerusalem was afterwards built. "According to the Rabbins its name is compounded of Jireh and Salem. The first was a name given by Abraham to the place where he purposed to sacrifice his son; and the latter, say they, was the name given to the royal station of Melchizedek, i. e. Shem. Now God, being unwilling to offend either of these patriarchs by adopting one name only, he combined them, whence Jesusalem."⁶ From the narrative itself one certainly never could have guessed that Abraham was near any inhabited place: one would have supposed that he went to worship alone in the solitude of the mountain—and that therefore he refuses the attendance of even his own servants. But no, it seems that here is a great city; a royal station. Or had this city, like those enchanted palaces in the olden tales of chivalry, vanished away with all its population, and left behind nothing but a barren mountain? Or is the authority of the Rabbins in this as in most other cases worth just nothing? I incline to this last supposition.

Verses 15-19. Jehovah moved by the ready obedience of Abraham repeats and confirms by an oath his former promises. He gives to Abraham a posterity numerous as the stars of heaven (see chap. xv. 5) and the sand on the sea-shore (see chap. xiii. 16): and as in the twelfth chapter he declared that in Abraham the families of the earth should be blessed, so now he promises that in his seed that blessing shall be continued. In this chapter however we have a phrase, "and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies," which though it may answer to "and I will

⁵ Roberts' Illustration of Scripture informs us that "the people of the East never say as those of England when taking leave, 'I go,' or 'I am going,' but, 'I go and re-

turn;' and that this is applicable to the Hebrew idiom of conversation.

⁶ Geographical Index to Bible, by the English editor of Calmet, art. *Jerusalem*.

curse him that curseth thee," is not to be found in any of the previous promises.

"And thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies: and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." *Væ victis!* Where is the nation that has welcomed its conquerors as a blessing? Terrible are the wars even of civilised people! fearful the oppression and intense the suffering caused by the best disciplined troops! And yet we fight for the sake of justice and out of a tender regard for the interests of our adversaries and our own; we conquer and oppress, too, with gentle words on our lips—and yet *even we*, though we regard ourselves as God's favourites, are in the eyes of our fallen enemies but God's scourges. I do not remember any victory gained or any conquest made by the chosen posterity of Abraham, which by the advantages it conferred could induce the wish to have been ranged among the conquered.

Verses 20-24. The chapter concludes with a genealogical table of the descendants of Abraham's brother Nahor, from which it seems that Rebecca, the future wife of Isaac, is the great-niece of Abraham.

All the portion of this chapter from verses 1 to 10 inclusive, which narrates the vision and journey of Abraham and his preparation for the sacrifice of his son, is written with the name Elohim: while all that from verses 11 to 19, also inclusive, which tells us of the miracle that stayed his hand, of the ram caught in the thicket and offered in the place of Isaac, and of the favour with which the Deity regarded the ready obedience of his servant, is, with a single exception,⁷ which Eichhorn supposes the fault of some copyist, written with the name Jehovah. The remainder of the chapter Eichhorn connects with the genealogies in chapter xii. 26-32, and regards them as most probably belonging to the Elohim legend.

⁷ In verse 12: "For I know that thou fearest God." See Eichhorn, *Einleitung in d. Alt. Test.* p. 416.

Eichhorn accounts for the peculiar division of the narrative part of this chapter, by supposing that the *editor* of Genesis selected from each of the two traditions before him those facts which it most fully detailed, and then published them in their present form. But how is it that he who has hitherto appeared as a compiler merely, who has so often and so studiously repeated himself, should all at once take upon him the office of a selector?

I cannot but remark too that this is the first time that a sacrifice—and what a sacrifice!—has been mentioned in connexion with the Elohim. But that sacrifice, observe, is never consummated, and the ram which is substituted for it is offered to Jehovah. With the help of a little etymology, what a field of conjecture one might disport in!

That part of the narrative which bears the name Jehovah resembles in the language of its promises the rest of the traditions to which it belongs. It sets before us, however, the obedience of Abraham as a new and powerful motive for the fulfilment of those promises.

With this chapter may we not connect Leviticus xxvii. 28, 29, as in some measure authorizing human sacrifices? And does not the law of redemption in Numbers xviii. 14, 15, imply that child sacrifices were not unknown to the ancient Israelites? May not that law be the modification of a more cruel custom, and one acquired during a residence in Canaan, but dropped by the more enlightened of the people during their sojourn in Egypt? Compare Diodor. Sic. lib. xx. § xiv. vol. ix. p. 40, with lib. i. § lxxvii. vol. i. p. 230.

CHAPTER XXI.

GENESIS xxiii. 1-20.

Verses 1-20. Sarah dies at Kirgath-arba. Abraham asks of its inhabitants permission to bury her body in their territory. This permission they willingly grant, and besides offer him a place in any one of their own family tombs. Abraham however expresses a wish to purchase of Ephron the cave and field of Machpelah; Ephron begs his acceptance of it as a gift; but at length estimates its value at four hundred shekels of silver, about nine pounds of our currency according to Michaelis, and upwards of fifty according to Voltaire.¹ Abraham immediately weighs out and delivers the money, and the land with the timber upon it is transferred to him and his heirs for ever.

In reading this chapter we are struck,

1. By the gentleness and courtesy of the manners with which it makes us acquainted. The several personages who take a part in this most ancient court display a regard for law and order, and a benevolence and kindness, which sufficiently attest the progress of civilisation—but of a civilisation which their merely complimentary generosity and their invariable abasement of self, with their exaggerated professions of respect for others, will not

¹ Michaelis, *Comment. ad h. l.*, (Notes de Gén.) that they are equal says that 400 shekels are worth to 1280 livres. Michaelis is the from 90 to 100 guilders; Voltaire better authority.

allow us to estimate too highly. It is too soft and effeminate for men, and too yielding and servile for citizens; it belongs either as *cause* or *consequence* to a despotism; and it is in fact even to this day the civilisation of the oppressed East.²

II. By the legal form of the whole transaction. The purchase takes place before the nobles and elders assembled in the most public part of the city. The money of a particular standard is weighed out in their presence, and in their presence the land with all trees and buildings thereunto belonging is made over unto Abraham. One would almost suppose that the author of Genesis had before him the original deed of sale, and that from it he had extracted the present chapter.

Verse 6. "Hear us, my lord, thou art a mighty prince among us," a prince of God. These words³ have been brought forward to show the greatness of Abraham, and the important part which he must have played in the traditions of Canaan. They fairly evidence the consideration in which Abraham was held, and probably therefore his power, but nothing further. As a nomad his wealth was easily estimated, but as a nomad he rather gained acquaintance with, than was known to, the several people among whom he dwelt; and as a man he was of a character too unobtrusive and peaceful, too little connected with great

² Roberts, in his *Illustrations of Scripture*, remarks on this passage, that in India "Respectable people are always saluted with the dignified title of 'My Lord;' hence English gentlemen are apt to suppose that they are taken for those of very high rank."....."The man of whom Abraham offered to purchase Machpelah *affected* to give the land.....And this fully accords with the conduct of those who are requested to dispose of a thing to a person of superior rank. Let the latter go and ask the price, and the owner will say, 'My Lord, it will

be a great favour if you will take it.' Should the possessor believe that one day he will need a favour from the great man, nothing will induce him to sell the article, and he will take good care through the servants or a friend that it shall soon be in his house. Should he, however, have no expectation of favour, he will say as Ephron, 'the thing is worth so much; your pleasure my Lord.'"

³ Vide Witsius, *ut supra*. He uses them in his argument to show that Abraham was raised to a deity by the Canaanites.

and striking⁴ events—the only events a people can remember—to have attracted the popular attention. He is a patriarch—the mythic hero of the family; not a demigod—the mythic hero of a nation.

Besides, if the children of Heth give Abraham the title of mighty prince, or prince of God, and address him as “my lord,” Abraham in his turn frequently bows himself before the children of Heth. This submissive language on the one side, and respectful action on the other, might enable a Marquis de Pisani,⁵ or a Lord Herbert of Cherbury,⁶ or any Spanish grandee⁷ of the seventeenth century, accurately to determine the relative rank of these high contracting parties; but as I think with Dr. Johnson,⁸ that there are points of precedence which it is ridiculous to settle, I am even content to regard Abraham and the Hittites as equals, and as treating with each other as equals. At the same time however we must observe, that when we speak of the Hittites as the equals of Abraham, we speak of them, not as individuals, but of them as forming a body, as collected together into a city, a republic. As Abraham then is one, the Hittites many, may we not to this difference between them trace the different forms in which they express their courtesy? For an assembly can more easily show its respect to an individual by a compliment of words, an individual to an assembly by a compliment of obeisance.

Verse 16. “Abraham weighed to Ephron four hundred shekels of silver current with the merchants.” If this chapter correctly describes the customs of the age of which it speaks; so early as the nineteenth century B.C. men had

⁴ The memory of his interference in favour of Sodom, &c., except in so far as it was preserved by his family, must have perished with Sodom.

⁵ *Historiettes de Tallemant des Réaux*, vol. i.

⁶ Vide his *Life by Himself*. He

and Pisani both set their lives on a point of precedence.

⁷ Vide *Mémoires de Bassompierre*; account of the cause of the illness and death of Philip III of Spain. (*Petitot Collect. de Mem.* vol. xx, p. 228-229.)

⁸ Vide *Boswell's Life of Johnson*.

learned to accommodate the precious metals to a certain recognised standard, and to look on them as a measure of value, and to make use of them as a medium of exchange; i. e. in other words, men had seized on and adopted the first rude idea of a metal currency. And that idea one would naturally suppose they would have gone on to develop and perfect; that very soon they would have begun to give to these metals, not merely a stamp which made known their quality, but one also which declared their weight; and that finally they would have divided them into pieces adapted to that scale of weights which was most suited to meet the wants of society; i. e. that they would have coined and issued money. But simple and evident and even necessary as this second step appears, centuries passed away ere it was taken; for Wilkinson tells us that coined money was not in use among the most ancient Egyptians; and as it is never mentioned by Homer, it was probably unknown both to the Greeks of his time and to those nations (Phœnicians and Egyptians⁹) with whom the Greeks were in habits of commercial intercourse. The date given to its invention is about nine hundred years B. C. How now account for this tardy progress?

When the great mass of the population of a country live on the produce of their labour; when each family provides generally for its own wants, and is both husbandman and manufacturer; and when all traffic is consequently in the hands of merchants who, in so far as the consumer is concerned, barter commodity (commonly raw material) with commodity, and who therefore only in great operations among themselves and with wealthy individuals ever have recourse to the precious metals (current with the merchant),—in such a state of society¹ I can very well con-

⁹ Wilkinson, however, is of opinion that the gold and silver rings which are painted on a tomb of the time of Thotmes III, 1495 B. C., represent the money of that epoch. I do not know on what grounds. Vide *Thebes*, p. 155.

¹ The Jews for instance, so long as the *family state* existed among them, i. e. till after the building of the second temple, though in habits of intercourse with the Phœnicians, had no coined money, according to De Pauw (*Egyptiens et Chinois*,

ceive that centuries might clapse ere the spirit of commerce, fostered by the division of labour, spread itself among the great body of a people, and urged upon them the necessity of some "common drudge 'tween man and man." To circumstances therefore, and not to any slowness of apprehension, I attribute the long interval which passed away between the first appreciation of the precious metals as a medium of exchange and the development afterwards given to that idea by the coining of money. Money in short I regard as the invention, not of an individual, but of an age, as one of those great inventions which spring out of the wants of society, as at once the consequence and cause of an extended commerce.

Verse 17. From this verse it is pretty clear,

1st. That land had already begun to be enclosed, either by hedges or by trees, which served as landmarks:—"and all the trees that were in the borders round about."

And 2ndly. That timber was considered of some value: and, as it is particularly mentioned in the deed of transfer, that it was not necessarily sold with the land, but that with the buildings it was an article of special agreement.

Verse 18. The whole of this transaction is represented as taking place in the open air, and in the most public thoroughfare of the city. The elders or nobles were most probably accustomed to assemble in the square before the city gates, and there to witness contracts, to give counsel, and to do judgment; and the common order of citizens who either happened to be present or were interested in any cause then and there to be decided, seem to have taken some share in the proceedings.²

vol. ii, p. 309.) Similarly in the early part of the middle ages, when society was again reduced to the family state, money was rare and little required. Vide Sismondi's *Hist. des Français*, part ii, c. xiv. And to this day in Syria, Volney asserts, money is weighed rather than

counted. Vide *Travels in Egypt and Syria*, c. xxxviii.

² Compare Job xxix, 7, and the description of a suit in *Iliad*, xviii, 497. There:

οἱ δὲ γερωντες
Εἶατ' ἐπὶ ζεστοῖσι λιθοῖς, ἱερῶ ἐν
κυκλῶ.

Among

Verse 20. Wilkinson says, "that the earliest monuments of Egyptian grandeur are to be found among their tombs; which were caves partly natural, partly cut out of the solid rock. They were situated without the city, and at the foot of some hill." Such probably was the cave of Machpelah. These caves were preferred from their exceeding dryness; they preserved the body uncorrupted for centuries;³ they accustomed the people to the sight of their departed ancestors; they stripped for them death of half its horrors. Men began to desire that their bodies should not see corruption; and their wishes were a duty to their surviving relations; but a duty, for the fulfilment of which in an unfavourable soil and climate they were obliged to have recourse to artificial means. Hence the early invention and wide-spread custom of embalming.

Because the first verse gives the sum of the years of Sarah's life, and because in the fifth stands the name of Elohim, Eichhorn regards this chapter as belonging to the Elohim portion of Genesis.

Michaelis⁴ observes, that this portion of Genesis so differs in tone and style from the rest of the book, that he cannot help considering it as a chapter by itself, as an extract from some old family document or some ancient title-deed, perhaps in part a copy from the original contract between Abraham and Ephron. If Michaelis is correct in his hypothesis, the art of writing (he elsewhere attempts to

Among the Celts the druidical circles served as the courts of justice. Vide Logan, *Scottish Gael*, ii, p. 325; and see also an account of the round mounts of Wales (*Toland's Hist. of the Druids*, p. 194), and of the uses to which the Breit Stein in the Alt Markt in Stralsund was formerly put. (*Erinnerungen*. v. E. M. Arndt. pref.)

³ Hence, perhaps it was that the Egyptians regarded their earthly houses but as caravanseras, inns, καταλυσεῖς; their graves, on the other hand, as eternal homes (Diod.

Sic. lib. i, § 51); and we may add, that because members of the same family were buried in the same tomb, very possibly arose the expression, "was gathered to his people," "was gathered to his fathers."—Is the expression Egyptian?

⁴ Comment. in d. Alt. Test. ad h. l.

⁵ Einleitung im Alt. Test. Because Callisthenes found that the astronomical calculations kept at Babylon embraced a period of 1903 years, Michaelis concludes that writing must have been in use among the Babylonians 2234 B. C.

prove that it must have been known 2234 years B. c.) was not only in ordinary use in the time of Abraham, but a specimen of the style and composition of that day has survived to our time.

On the conjectures of both Michaelis and Eichhorn we may remark, that neither of them accounts for the extraordinary difference between the state of society represented in this, and in any other chapter. Take for instance the agreement or alliance made with Abimelech in the twenty-first chapter and compare it with this contract. *There* every thing depended on certain tokens (the seven ewe lambs given and received) to which the parties can appeal; they serve as helps to the memory of the witnesses. *Here* all the proceedings are in the market-place before certain persons; and *here* are no tokens save only the record of the proceedings themselves. The first is the contract of a rude and unlettered age; the second that of man advanced in civilization.

Again, with regard to this Kirjath-arba, does the representation here given of it, its superior culture, and the value of the land about it, at all accord with the notions the first mention of it (chapter xiii. 18) would raise in our minds? From that chapter we would have supposed Mamre some rich but yet unoccupied desert, in the deep seclusions of which Abraham had erected an altar to pray to his God. We see it now a cultivated plain, divided into various portions, and occupied by different individuals—the domain of Hebron.

Another peculiarity of this chapter is, that it shows us Sarah (the hitherto faithful companion of all Abraham's wanderings) as now living and finishing her days apart from Abraham: he lives at Beersheba, she in Hebron; and he arrives not to console her in her last moments, but to bury her and inherit her property.

CHAPTER XXII.

GENESIS xxiv, 1-67.

Verses 1-9. Abraham is about to disappear from the scene, but he makes a noble exit; the last and crowning act of his life is altogether worthy of him. There he is, "old and well-stricken in age," but "having strongest soul, when most his reins do bow:" there he is, as in his youth, still occupied wholly with his immense hopes, and still meditating on the promises which have given colour and character to his existence: there he is, labouring, even in a last solemn injunction to his friend and servant, to ensure the happiness of his son, the purity of his race, and the possession of the Holy Land. His daughter-in-law must be of his own kindred, and must willingly leave her father's house and her own country, and must settle in Canaan.

"And Abraham said unto his eldest servant of his house"—not to the eldest in age, but to the eldest or first in place—"that ruled over all that he had." But this *major domo*, this *maire du palais*, was not, according to Michaelis,¹ that Eliezar of Damascus, that steward of whom we

¹ Comment. ad cap. xv. 4. As Fourmont, however, found Chronos in Abraham, so on the faith of this embassy, he sees Mercury in Eliezar. With him, too, Atlas is Lot—Atlas, Atolas, by transposition for Alotas—and Minerva, Theban name Ogya, Hagar; and he adds: "Qu'on se souvienne que dans le texte de Sanchoniathon pour Ἀττικην il faut lire Ζαυτικην. Il ne repugne point du tout que Κρονος ou

Abraham ait fait avoir à Hagar ou à son fils la seigneurie de Sais."—Anciens Peuples, vol. i, p. 81. How forced and impossible do all these identifications appear when they are simply placed before us; how plausible and natural, if we will but labour through the folios and quartos in which great learning and no inconsiderable acuteness have developed their etymological theories!

have already heard, now too old for such a mission, but some other trusty servant of the wealthy Abraham.

Verse 4. "But thou shalt go unto my country to my kindred, and take a wife to my son Isaac." As the offspring of marriage contracts between individuals of the same family are considered to be in general puny, unhealthy and degenerate; such marriages (and here we stand at issue with the ancient world) are in our day almost universally condemned. Our views we confirm by analogies drawn from the breeding of animals and the produce of seeds. And

I. As regards seeds. It is a common field axiom that the same seed repeatedly sown in the same ground at length deteriorates in its produce. M. Macaire however, by the aid of experiment, has proved "that the noxious matter thrown out by the roots of vegetables unfits the soil for the growth of the same plant, though it may be beneficial to another kind."² Our axiom is therefore too narrow; for it is the continued succession of similar crops, and not merely the same seed sown again and again in the same ground, which materially affects the produce of the land, both as regards quantity and quality. And Mr. Le Couteur,³ in his pamphlet on wheat, speaking of its supposed tendency to degenerate, observes that that degeneracy is but the natural result of the mixed, good and bad, varieties of seed originally sown, which in the course of several crops necessarily change the proportion in which they at first stood one to the other, and consequently also the quality of their joint produce; *i. e.* he observes that good seed under ordinary circumstances produces good grain, and inferior seed inferior grain; but that when both are sown mixed together, the proportion of quantity in which they originally stood one to the other varies as the one or the

² From Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, vol. ii, p. 3, note.

³ This is quoted from memory; I have not the pamphlet by me;

it is Mr. Le Couteur's argument for a more minute classification of seeds.

other seed has been most prolific. So far as seed is concerned then, our axiom cannot bear the test of a crucial experience.

II. As regards animals,⁴ every breeder tells us that in-and-in-breeding, *i. e.* breeding from animals of near blood, will almost certainly produce an unhealthy and degenerate stock. How far is this assertion well founded? Physiologists have ascertained that the physical defects and weaknesses of the parents are frequently inherited by the offspring. And nature has accordingly provided for the maintenance of a healthy and vigorous race, particularly among polygynic animals, by making the females the prize of the strongest male.⁵ Suppose now that among our domestic animals none but individuals of the same family were ever put together for the purposes of breeding; then, as our choice is limited, it will often happen that an inferior and weakly animal, one either accidentally⁶ or originally defective, must be employed either as sire or dam to propagate its species; and such an animal will in general produce a weak and sickly offspring. But this inferiority of the offspring is as a general rule to be attributed, not to any nearness of blood existing between the parents, but to either the weakness or defective organization of one or both of them.

"There is no objection then to in-and-in breeding." Not so. For if the sire and dam be brother and sister,⁷

⁴ Because animals rather reproduce *the species*, and thus differ from plants, which reproduce the *individual*. In treating of the breeding of animals we can present only probable results, to which there are many exceptions.

⁵ "Bei vielen Thieren, am stärksten bei den polygynischen, ist das Männchen sehr eifersüchtig, und kämpft sich mit seinen Nebenbuhlern. Der Hirsch erkämpft sich seine Weibchen, welche nun sein Eigenthum bleiben; das Weibchen sieht dem Kampfe gelassen zu und überläßt sich nach demselben so-

gleich dem Sieger," &c.—Burdach, vol. i, § 254, f.

⁶ That accidental defects may at length become organic and hereditary, is a fact acknowledged. See the evidence, particularly Sir Ant. Carlisle's, in the Report to the House of Commons on our manufactures. The effect of certain habits on the organization Blumenbach proves (?) by the peculiar form of the canine teeth in the mummies of Egyptian priests.—Apud Burdach.

⁷ Or if they be descended from any common stock, from or through

and if the dam for instance suffer from any constitutional or organic defect, that defect, though it may never break out in disease, will not improbably have been inherited by her brother also, and will therefore almost inevitably descend to their joint progeny. But if the weakly dam had been put to an animal of strange blood, one free from the hereditary defects of the brother, though inferior in both size and strength to him; then the offspring, even though they had inherited the constitutional tendencies of their dam, would have inherited them modified probably by other tendencies which they owed to their sire; and by the infusion of new blood the young stock would thus have acquired fresh strength and vigour. The general rule then seems to be this: Do not breed from animals having hereditary tendencies to the same diseases; and as a corollary to this rule, Do not breed from animals in which, as descended from the same stock, as nearly allied one to the other, the same diseases are probably hereditary.

Besides, if this in-and-in breeding be in itself so pernicious, how do we account for the life-crowded earth and sea and air? For if, as is generally supposed, all animals are descended each after its kind from a single pair; then, as for some generations at least no offspring could be born but from animals of near blood, the race must have gone on deteriorating, and that without a chance of improvement, as all animals of the same kind being in fact of the same blood, any infusion of fresh or strange blood was impossible; the animal races of our time are consequently but the degenerate representatives of those of the yet infant world. But if it be here objected that we have no evidence whatever that only one pair of animals of a kind were created, then we may point to the several *factitious* breeds^s of animals, *i.e.* to those breeds which man has by many crosses at length succeeded in establishing, and which once

which they both inherit the same disease or tendencies to it.

^s Or to the descendents of pairs of animals set on newly discovered

lands. Burdach mentions a pair of rabbits set upon an island, which in two years had increased to six thousand. *Physiologie*, vol. i, § 268.

established he has taken care to keep pure and unmixed; such are our race-horses, Marlborough and King Charles's spaniels, &c.—all of them breeds descended each one from a common parent, and yet all of them containing individuals which we look upon as the finest specimens of their kinds. On the whole then it seems to me that in-and-in breeding as regards animals is subject to no special laws,—or more properly, that as applicable to the animal creation all breeding follows the same great laws.

III. As regards man. We find:

1st. Some barbarous nations who allow and encourage intermarriages between near relations. Among the Ostiacks no degree of relationship is an impediment to marriage;⁹ and though the son will not marry his mother, the father often takes his own daughter to wife, and the brother his own sister. The Ostiacks however are eaten up with scorbutic diseases; but then they eat raw and putrid flesh, and are besides an exceedingly dirty people. In California we are told that “parentage or relationship forms no obstacle to intermarriage;” and the Californians are described as a small deteriorated race, “but as very healthy, notwithstanding their filthy habits.” Their small size we may attribute to the badness of their food: “they make flour of acorns, which they grind and make gruels and balls of it.”¹ The native inhabitants of New South Wales, Turnbull² says, are divided into families, the individuals of which generally marry among themselves, though they consider any union between relatives nearer than first cousins unlawful. These people are

⁹ “Les degrés de parenté ne mettent aucun obstacle à ces unions conjugales. Un fils n'épouse pas sa mère, *parceque les mères sans doute sont déjà vieilles lorsque leurs enfans sont nubiles*; mais on voit des pères faire leurs femmes de leurs propres filles, et des frères épouser leurs sœurs.” (Hist. Gén. des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 516.) “L'excessive malpropreté dans la-

quelle ils vivent, les viandes crues et infectes dont ils se nourrissent, leur causent des maladies scorbutiques,” &c. (Id. p. 524.)

¹ Forbes' California, p. 189, 190, 196. They are healthy “in their native state only; it is very far otherwise in their domesticated state.”

² Voyage round the World, vol. i, p. 81.

quick of eye and ear, but meagre in their persons; perhaps because they are subject to great vicissitudes of plenty and famine. Similarly the Caribbees we are informed always choose their wives from among their relations; but they, unlike the other nations we have passed in review, are placed before us as a tall, and straight-limbed, and broad-shouldered, and healthy, and long-lived race.³ But to leave these uncertain accounts of barbarous people, we find that,

2ndly. Among comparatively civilised nations, and among those too who more particularly studied the material and external world, several have allowed and even encouraged the intermarriage of near relations. The ancient Greeks⁴ permitted all relatives, save parents and children, to marry one with another; thus the six sons of Æolus are married to his six daughters; Iphidamas and Diomed to their maternal aunts; and Alcinous to his niece. Among the Hindus, those of good caste to the utmost avoid the alliances of strangers; they ever seek to marry their children into families to which they are already united by ties of blood or affinity; and the marriage is preferred in proportion as the contracting parties are nearly related.⁵

³ Sitten d. Wilden, vol. ii: "Sie sich nur mit Weibern aus ihrer Verwandschaft verheyrathen."—P. 10. "Sie sind meistens von cinem hohen Wuchs und wohlgebaut, von breiten Schultern und Huften, und von gesunder Natur." (p. 17.)....." Man trifft unter ihnen keine Krüppel und ungestaltete Personen an, keine Blinde, keine Kahlköpfe die es von Natur sind."—Id. p. 18.

⁴ Feithii Antiq. Homer. c. xiii. The same was the custom of the ancient Romans, according to Vico: "Le nozze dei Romani si celebravano *acqua et igne*; perchè i primi matrimonj naturalmente si contrassero tra uomini e donne ch' avevano l'acqua e'l fuoco comune, e si erano d'una stessa fami-

lia; onde da' fratelli e sorelli dovettero incominciare." — Scienza Nuova, § 276. See also the institutions of Manco Capac with regard to marriage. (Garcilasso de la Vega, Hist. des Yncas, c. xxi, § i, p. 46.)

⁵ "Les Indiens de bonne caste évitent autant qu'ils le peuvent de contracter des alliances étrangères, et ils cherchent toujours à marier leurs enfans dans des familles avec lesquelles ils sont déjà unis par les liens de consanguinité ou d'affinité. Les mariages se font d'autant plus volontiers, que les contractans sont plus proches parens." — Dubois, Mœurs des Indes, vol. i, p. 10, 30. See the rules to be observed in the choice of a wife. (Instit. of Menu, c. iii, § 5, 10.)

Of the physical condition of the Hindus generally, Dubois gives us no very favourable opinion⁶; but Von Bohlen describes them as handsome, tall, and slender, and well-built and well-proportioned, though somewhat effeminate in appearance, as a race of men far superior to the Aborigines and mixed population of India.⁷ The Egyptians allowed brothers and sisters to marry;⁸ and from the exclusive character of their priesthood,⁹ we may presume that among them, as among the Hindus, individuals of high caste generally chose wives from out of their own families. Herodotus nevertheless speaks of them as the healthiest people then known next to the Lybians, and as the people who paid the most attention to their health.¹ The Persians regard marriage as something in itself most holy; but a marriage between cousins-german is an action, says Zoroaster, which merits heaven; and every page of his law evidences the attention which he paid to health, and the horror in which he held all deformity.² Similarly the Jews, though oppressed by sanitary laws and degraded by any mal-conformation of body,³ preferred alliances with their own kindred.⁴ But if family intermarriages were so

⁶ "On n'y rencontre que très peu de bossus, très peu de boiteux, autres que ceux qui le deviennent par accident.....En revanche le nombre des aveugles y est considérable" (ut supra, p. 445). Again: "La faiblesse des facultés mentales chez les peuples de l'Inde paraît être proportionnée à celles des facultés corporelles. Je ne crois pas qu'il existe d'autre nation civilisée qui compte dans son sein autant de gens idiots ou stupides."—Id. p. 452.

⁷ "Die Brahmanen-hindus wie man sie im Gegensatz der Urbewohnern nennen kann sind gross und schlank, wohlgebaut und proportionirt, aber wenig muskelos," &c.—Das Alt. Indien, vol. i, p. 47. Von Bohlen describes the high-caste Brahmins of the Dekkan; Dubois the mixed population of

the Isouri. Vide Von Bohlen, Ib. p. 24.

⁸ Diodorus Siculus, ut supra.

⁹ Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, vol. i, p. 271.

¹ Vide Herodotus, lib. ii, § 77, and the passages in Wilkinson, ut supra, vol. iii, p. 391, &c.

² "Zoroastre recommande le mariage entre cousins-germains comme une action qui mérite le Ciel."—Zend. vol. ii, p. 612. For the importance attached to health, see Fargard xv, xvi.

³ See Levit. xxi. 17.

⁴ Thus Tobit, in his instructions to his son Tobias: "Beware of all whoredom, my son; and chiefly take a wife of the seed of thy fathers; and take not a strange woman to wife which is not of thy father's tribe.....Remember, my son that our fathers, even from the

pernicious, would the fact have escaped the observation of these people to whom it was of such importance.

But though by an examination into the condition of different people who have allowed or encouraged family intermarriages we may have shown that there is no reason to suppose that such marriages perniciously affect the national physical character; yet as they may be comparatively rare, we can arrive at no accurate conclusion as to their tendencies, until we can state the proportion which their offspring bears to the whole population;—as we are unable to do this, we must look for some historical family, the members of which were accustomed to marry amongst themselves, and then examine whether its descendants showed any extraordinary or unexpected marks of degeneracy. Such a family was the Bacchiadian,⁵ the oligarchy of Corinth; for two hundred years they ruled, and prosperously ruled their native city; and during that time they founded several great colonies, and produced several distinguished men.⁶ That they did not intellectually degenerate, their position and their deeds sufficiently prove; and that they were physically a fine race, I think we may gather from the very story of the lame and rejected Labda.⁷ Such another family was the Ptolemaic, in which brother frequently married sister; and yet of these sovereigns of Egypt, though morally depraved, I do not remember that, with the exception of Ptolemy Physcon, they were as men deficient in either personal attraction or mental power. And such another family was that of the Yncas of Peru. They were compelled to marry their nearest surviving relative,—the sister was preferred; and yet read their histories, compare them with their subjects, and they are indeed “children of the sun.”⁸

beginning, *that they married wives of their own kindred, and were blessed in their children.*—iv. 12.

⁵ Βακχιαδαί. ἐδίδουσαν δὲ καὶ ἡγοντο ἐξ ἀλλήλων.—Herod. v. 92.

⁶ Archias, founder of Syracuse; Chersikrates of Corcyra; Eumelos

the poet; Philolaos the lawgiver, &c.—Müller, *die Dorier*, vol. i, p. 102, 129; vol. ii, p. 200.

⁷ Herod. ut supra.

⁸ Garcilasso de la Vega, *Hist. des Yncas*.

But we will view the question in another light ; we will look at those nations, and into the history of those families, who in forming matrimonial alliances avoid or have avoided all degrees of consanguinity. Such are the Samojedes :⁹ no one among them will marry a girl who is of a common descent, never mind how distant, with himself. Well, surely if there be such virtue in the mixing of bloods, the Samojedes are pre-eminent among their fellow-men ? They are indeed a healthy because a well-fed people ; but among the smallest and ugliest of known races.¹ Look too at the condition of Europe during the dark ages ; *then* marriages between relatives to the seventh degree were prohibited ; and yet these are the ages of plagues and pestilence, of choleras, leprosies, and sweating-sickness, of human degeneracy.² Or take a family. Look into the history of the Merovingian kings. They married neither sisters nor cousins, but took them wives of all which they chose ; and after three descents their first burst of energy was already exhausted ; and fathers at fifteen, old men at thirty, they but dragged out another century of an unnoticed existence. Examine also the sovereigns of the Carlovingian dynasty : they sought out for fair women and married them ; and after three or four generations they too had faded away. Compare these ephemeral races with the Capetian that succeeded them. This last endea-

⁹ " Ils évitent scrupuleusement dans leurs mariages les degrés de consanguinité ou de parenté, jusqu'à là qu'un homme n'épousera jamais une fille qui descend, comme lui, d'une même famille, à quelque degré d'éloignement que ce soit." — Histoire Générale des Voyages, vol. xviii, p. 509.

¹ " Ces hommes sont pour la plupart d'une taille au dessous de la moyenne." .. " Ils ont le corps dur et nerveux, les jambes courtesle cou très court, et la tête grosse.....le visage aplati, les yeux noirs et médiocrement ouverts, le nez tellement écrasé que le bout en

est à-peu-près au niveau de l'os de la machoire supérieure qu'ils ont fort élevées, la bouche grande, et les lèvres minces." (Id. p. 502.).... " La chasse en hiver et la pêche en été leur fournissent abondamment la nourriture nécessaire." — (Id. p. 504.

² We might instance Sicily. Mankind seems to have given itself rendezvous on its shores. Sicilians, Greeks, Dorians and Ionians, Africans, Romans, Vandals, Arabs, Normans, Germans, French, have all contributed to its population—and that population is certainly not a fine race of men.

voured rather to perpetuate itself by family alliances; cousin has married with cousin, uncle with niece, and after nine centuries it flourishes still, occupying half the thrones of Europe.

With man then, as with the rest of the animal creation, it seems,

1st. That strong and perfectly healthy parents, never mind how closely allied in blood, generally procreate strong and healthy children; and on the other hand,

2ndly. That weak and diseased parents, though wholly unconnected in blood, generally produce offspring weak and sickly like themselves.

But again as children may and do inherit, not the constitutional tendencies of one parent merely, but the modified constitutional tendencies of both, it follows,

1st. That healthy parents, but each of them with a certain *latent* tendency to disease, *though not to the same disease*, may produce children inheriting indeed, though probably in a less degree, their different constitutional tendencies; and consequently produce children, to say the least, as healthy as themselves.³ And

2ndly. That healthy parents, but with latent tendencies to the same disease, may indeed procreate children inheriting these tendencies only in the same degree as themselves; but most probably they will procreate children in whom these tendencies are developed and active, unhealthy children.

As regards now family intermarriages, but considering marriage only in so far as it has for its object the procreation of a healthy and vigorous offspring, we will observe,

1st. That no one who, through his father say, inherits

³ I say with latent tendencies to disease, because where is the family that has not on the father or mother's side its hereditary malady? And throughout I speak generally; for as in breeding animals you will sometimes find the female throwing young wholly unlike to either the sire or herself, but

whose make, &c. you can trace to a cross which took place some generations back in the ancestors of either of the parents; so also no doubt the bad constitution of a great grandfather may, skipping the intermediate descents, be inherited by the great-grandchild.

tendencies to any particular disease, should venture to contract an alliance with a paternal aunt; or though the mixture of other blood has diminished the risk, even with a first-cousin on the father's side. But in so far at least as that particular disease is concerned, he may, without the slightest danger of developing it in his children, intermarry with either his mother's sister or her niece.

And 2ndly. That no one will intermarry into the family of either of his parents, who observes, both in himself and in his brothers and sisters, an increased development of those defects (as ungainly form, small stature, &c.) which characterise the family of one of them, and from which that of the other appears free; for he perceives that the mixture of the two bloods favours instead of correcting these defects.

The general rule for marriage then is this:

If you belong to a healthy and well-formed family, with a wife of the same family you will produce healthy and well-formed children. If on the other hand you are of an unhealthy and ill-formed race; marry into some family of better blood, and thus seek to correct the impurities of your own.

But a question suggests itself.

Is it desirable to mix races? Are the children of a negro and a white, or of a negro and a Hindu, or of a Hindu and a red man, improvements on the inferior parents? are they an approach to a higher type of Humanity? Or if we take individuals of the same race but of different countries and climates; if we unite an Englishman to an Arabic woman, or a Spaniard to a Dane; or if we take individuals of the same country but of different ranks and habits, if we ally the gentleman to the peasant, what will be the produce of these several unions? Will their progeny equal children born from parents of the same country and of the same station in life?

Verses 10, 14. The faithful servant sets forth on his journey. He arrives at the city of Nahor, but he does not

immediately proceed to Nahor's house, to demand one of Nahor's daughters in marriage; no, seated near the public well, he considers within himself how he may best execute the commission with which he has been entrusted, and—with that timidity of character, *we* would say, which is often mistaken for piety, but rationally enough considering the views which he and his age entertained of the divine providence—he concludes on leaving the matter in God's hands.

Rousseau in his "Confessions," mentions, that in the earlier part of his life he was often troubled with doubts and fears as to his lot in a future world: but that one day as he was strolling in the fields, he suddenly took up a stone and aiming at a tree which stood at some distance, determined that if he hit the tree, and he was but a bad marksman, he should look on himself as saved,—if he missed it, as damned. He fortunately hit the mark, he adds, and from that day forward regarded his salvation as certain. Abraham's ambassador however, does not go to work quite so blindly: for he resolves on choosing, not the first maiden who offers him her services, but the first who willingly grants the service asked of her. As the question proceeds from him, he secures, youth, health, beauty, and a suitable rank; and the answer he requires, and which is to seal his choice, speaks the future bride's kindly and willing disposition.

Again Abraham's servant not improbably takes on himself the initiative of the conversation, because he conceives that that maiden shows no maidenly spirit, who unasked offers an apparently wealthy stranger so slight a service as a drink of water; or he feels that a woman's attentions may sometimes be but "a chevril glove" to her curiosity, and an evidence rather of an impudent officiousness than of a well-natured disposition. In this wooer's mode of proceeding there is some method: and with all his trust in Providence, he displays, despite the fairy-tale rashness of his plan, no little shrewdness and practical wisdom.

Verses 15-52. Rebekah comes to the well to draw water,

and does just what was required of her ; on this Abraham's servant proceeds to her father's house, and proposes for her in his master's name. His offer is accepted, and the marriage is regarded by both parties as literally a marriage "made in heaven," as proceeding from the Lord.

Put out the piety which does not belong to our age, and change the form of expression a little, and this marriage negotiation which took place B. C. 1840, will do very well for A. D. 1840. A proposal for the daughter of a family is still, as it was then, a mere statement of rent roll,—“seven hundred pounds and possibilities is good gifts,”—to which is now affixed an assurance—and herein we differ from the men of the olden world—not that the contemplated marriage is God's will, but that it is equally desired by, and will be for the mutual happiness of, the parties principally interested.

Have we then degenerated? Are we more selfish and less pious than the men of the ancient time? I think not. The world was for them some inextricable labyrinth, the issues and confused windings and mazes of which were known only to its great Maker. To Him, therefore, and He was ever near them, on all great occasions they looked: at every doubtful turn, they prayed for His assistance, they required His willing counsel, and their own desperate resolves they then regarded as His inspirations. They were like docile, because timorous, children, who fly the responsibility of self-conduct. We however have found an Ariadne. The clue of the labyrinth is ours. We rejoice in its exquisite beauty, its perfect order. Curiously we trace it through its thousand turnings and returnings; we know its great alleys, its issues and its entrances. We are men; and God has given us star and compass; and we pray now, not for His help in our career after fortune or happiness, but for pure hearts, so that whatever may be our fates we may never disgrace His service.

Verse 50. “Then Laban and Bethuel answered.” Is this Bethuel, Bethuel the father? How then is it that

throughout this busy chapter we only once find his name, and only once hear his voice, and hear it but as the echo of Laban's? Was he worn out and imbecile with age, that he had given up the government of his house and family? For to his son he leaves it to invite the approaching guest, and to dispose of his only daughter in marriage, and to accept her dowry? Rather, was he not dead? and is not his name here a form or an interpolation?

Verse 53. *Wherever* women are condemned to severe and perpetual labour, *wherever* they are more or less the slaves, first of their parents and afterwards of their husbands, *there* they are also regarded as property, and *there* the father will not part with his daughter but for a valuable consideration: hence the custom among barbarous nations, as in ancient Peru, in Siberia, among the Tartars, the negroes of Guinea and Senegal, and the Arabs, and even among the Chinese, of purchasing the bride by a dower.⁴ Were "these precious things" which Abraham's servant presented to Laban and his mother the dower or purchase-money of Rebecca? I should conclude so from the price, fourteen years of servitude, which the poor Jacob was compelled to pay for Laban's daughters, Leah and Rachel. Was the wife in these times then only the slave and property of the husband?⁵

⁴ Mill's *British India*, vol. i, book ii, p. 384. Robertson's *America*, p. 311; *Histoire Gén. des Voyages*, vol. v; p. 180; xviii, p. 565, &c. In *Menu* however—and in *India*, the woman nevertheless holds an inferior and dependant station (v. ix, 2, 18, &c.)—the sale of daughters appears as something disgraceful. "Let no father who knows the law," he advises, "receive a gratuity however small for giving his daughter in marriage; since the man, who

through avarice takes a gratuity for that purpose, is a seller of his offspring."—*Institutes*, c. iii, § 51. In *Menu* there seems a desire to raise the condition of the woman. See *Id.* § 56, 60, &c.

⁵ The custom may however continue after the woman is comparatively emancipated, and even the wife may be purchased and receive a jointure at one and the same time. So Agamemnon offers Achilles, of his daughters—

"The worthiest let him take

All *joynturelesse*, to Peleus court: *I will her joynture make*,
And that so great as never yet did any maide preferre;
Seven cities right magnificent I will bestow on her."

Il. ix. 144, Chapman.

“And the servant brought forth jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and gave them to Rebecca.” “Among the Orientals,” says Volney, “the only articles of luxury are goldsmith’s work, which is confined to women’s trinkets, *saucers* for coffee wrought like lace, the ornaments of their harness, their pipes, *and the silk stuffs of Aleppo and Damascus.*”⁶ The Hindoos too, according to Dubois, have the same tastes; the wives of the very poorest among them (and their poverty is beyond anything we can conceive) possess silver bracelets, and wear earrings generally of gold.⁷

Verses 54-67. Rebecca leaves the home of her father, and dwells with Isaac in the tent of Sarah.

Verse 55. “Let the damsel abide with us a few days, at the least ten.” The marginal reading has “a full year or ten months.” Again ten months, as in the deluge! Have we not somewhat too lightly taken it for granted that the year in these early times was of twelve months, or three hundred and sixty days?

In my observations on the deluge, I suggested that by putting out the fifth verse of the eighth chapter as an

⁶ Travels in Syria, vol. ii, chap. xxxix, p. 287.

⁷ For the wretched condition of the Hindus, see Dubois, part i, chap. vi. “Les moins misérables possèdent un vase de cuivre pour boire.....des bracelets d’argent valant trois ou quatre roupies, à l’usage des femmes,” &c.—vol. i, p. 102. “Tous les Indiens portentdes pendans d’oreilles.”—id. p. 469. Dubois goes on to say: “Ces pendans d’oreilles, quelquefois d’une grosseur démesurée, sont un nouveau témoignage de la persévérance des Indiens dans leurs antiques habitudes, car les auteurs sacrés et profanes attestent que des ornemens d’une pareille nature ex-

étaient ailleurs des temps immémoriaux.”—Id. I find however the same ornaments—among the Peruvians: “Des pendans d’oreille de la largeur d’un pied de bocal.” (Hist. des Yncas, p. 48.)—and indeed amongst almost all uncivilized people, who, instead of asking “Jahre lang schon bedien’ ich mich meiner Nase zum Riechen; “Hab’ ich denn aber an sie auch ein erweisliches Recht?” seem to think that their ears and noses were made to stick ornaments on. I call the wearing of earrings, &c. not the perseverance in an old custom, but a custom which belongs to a certain stage of Humanity.

interpolation, we might render it highly probable that the sabbatical cycle was known to and observed by the antediluvian ages. I thought this an emendation, but was obliged to reject it as directly opposed to the facts of the history. And if now to ascertain the length of the patriarchal year I refer to the narrative of the deluge, I find, on adding together the several periods mentioned there, that the last dove was sent from the ark on the three hundred and thirty-second day of the year, and that the year therefore, unless some error have crept into the text, was of more than ten months, or three hundred days.

But the narrative of the deluge, as it at present stands, presents many difficulties; suppose therefore some error in its text; suppose its year to have consisted but of ten months,—and it speaks but of ten; then, if we reject the forty days in the sixth verse of chapter the eighth, we have a year just such as we require; and if moreover we make Noah to send forth the raven on the first day of the tenth month, and seven days afterwards the dove, and so on to the opening of the ark, we shall find, supposing Noah to have entered the ark on a sabbath, that the first and second day^s of the tenth month is also a sabbath; that in fact all the great divisions or epochs in the deluge fall on a sabbath, except the opening of the ark, which takes place only eight days after the flight of the last dove, and takes place consequently on the first day of the week, also the first day of the first month of the new year, the first year of Noah's seventh century, the birth-year of the new earth. We thus have a conjectural emendation which reduces the length of the year to the number of months mentioned in the text, which accounts for every day spent in the ark, and which in accordance with the views of the olden world

^s The Sabbath beginning on the evening of the *first*—the Jews reckoning the day from sunset to sunset—Noah would probably delay sending forth the bird until the morning of the *second* day of the tenth month. And if he waited

the whole of the Sabbath for the return of the last dove, he would wait its return till the sunset of the last day of the year, and would not therefore probably uncover the ark until the first day of the new year.

commemorates only certain days—an emendation moreover plausible enough, but one with which I am not so much in love as to regard it as anything more than a conjecture.

Verse 60. In India, to be the mother of a numerous offspring is considered a great honour. “Hence parents often say to their daughters, ‘Be thou the mother of thousands.’ Beggars also when relieved say to the mistress of the house, ‘Ah, madam, millions will come from you.’.... Brahmins in blessing their followers say, ‘The blessings of children are yours.’”⁹ In Egypt too we find the same longing desire for offspring. An Egyptian will divorce his wife because she is barren, or he will marry a second, and make the childless one her slave. There, children, the husband seems to consider, are the one end and object of marriage; and there the wife, besides that desire for them which is natural to her sex, longs for them because her destiny depends upon her becoming a mother.¹

Verse 63. “And Isaac went out to meditate in the field at even-tide.” The marginal reading has “to pray.” Michaelis and De Wette however translate the passage as if Isaac went out to look whether there was trace or tidings of the returning messenger. I must own that the prayer in the field seems to me in keeping neither with the language of this book nor with the character of these times. For infant man prayer is too solemn an act to be lightly engaged in; it requires the prestige of the altar and the sacrifice.³

⁹ Roberts’ Illustration of the Sacred Scriptures, p. 29, 125.

¹ Lane’s Modern Egyptians.

² Michaelis: “Isaak ging gegen die Abendzeit in das Feld, sich umzusehen, ob er nichts in der Ferne erblickte, und ward gewahr das Camele kamen.” De Wette: “Und er war ausgegangen umherzuwandeln auf dem Felde gegen

Abend, und erhob seine Augen,” &c.

³ Are not the very prayers which are wrung from these men by any present necessity, and which admit not of the delay of sacrifice, but which are always accompanied by a vow of future or an appeal to past service, an evidence that prayer was not with them a habit, but something rare and solemn?

This chapter is written with the name Jehovah; and though in the third and seventh verses Abraham speaks of Jehovah as the Elohim of the heaven and of the earth, and Abraham's servant, in the twelfth, twenty-seventh, forty-second, and forty-eighth verses, of Jehovah as the Elohim of his master, Eichhorn⁴ accounts for this addition as necessary to the construction.

⁴ "Jehova bleibt immer das proprium Gottes nicht im statu constructo stehen kann."—Einleitung im A. T. vol. iii, § 416, p. 131.

CHAPTER XXIII.

GENESIS xxv, 1-10.

Verses 1-10. Abraham marries another wife, begets more children, dies in a good old age, and is buried by his sons in the cave of Machpelah.

Of these descendants of Abraham by Keturah we may observe, that the name of Dedan has already appeared in the genealogy of Cush; Sheba and Asshurim in the genealogies of both Cush and Shem. These different men bearing the same name, are each of them, according to Bochart,¹ the fathers of a different people. The Dedanites of Cush are celebrated as great merchants by Ezekiel: the Dedanites of Abraham lived in the interior of Idumea, and were celebrated for nothing. The Shebaïtes of Cush and Shem, like the Dedanites of Cush, were a commercial nation: the Shebaïtes of Abraham, like the Ishmaelites, were robbers.² The trade of the Mosaic world then seems to have been almost entirely in the hands of the cursed, while robbery was the monopoly of the blessed, race.

In these ancient times commerce must have been something very different from what it is in our day, or Moses viewed it with very prejudiced eyes. From the story of Joseph, and several passages in the Odyssey, I suspect that it served often but as a colourable pretext for the most atrocious villanies; that traders were then little better than

¹ *Geographia Sacra*, Pt. ii, chap. xxv; Pt. iv, chap. vi, &c. commercii et ex quarto latrociniis dediti."—*Ibid.*

² "E primis tribus nati populi

disguised thieves, who either forcibly carried off unprotected maidens, or with some glittering gew-gaw, some useless glass beads, tempted the simple and unwary landsman to sell his children: a sort of visitors whom vanity, cupidity, the love of novelty, eagerly welcomed; but whose visits were ever afterwards remembered with the bitterest regret. They were cunning, sneaking, and therefore hateful thieves, who stole against all law, and knew no measure to their desires. The Abrahamites, on the other hand, were bold and national robbers, who stole openly and according to law, and from their enemies only, and with a certain moderation, and who were therefore as robbers respectable and much respected.

Verse 6. In this spring-time of the yet youthful world, what a rich inheritance of hope fell to the lot of poor younger brothers! They went forth,—not as now to work, that they might eat, to heap up petty gains into a fortune,—but to become the founders of cities, the fathers of nations, the revered ancestors of kings. Their's was a high and glorious destiny, an imperishable name, which was to be read not in books nor in monumental alabaster, but which lived in the blood and thrilled on the lips of a whole people.

“And his sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machpelah,” &c. Ishmael is not ranked among the sons of the concubines, though like them he is sent away from his father's home. With Isaac he seems to have tended Abraham's last moments; and with Isaac to have followed Abraham to the grave. He has all the forgiving generosity of a daring spirit.

Of this chapter (closing at the tenth verse) we may observe, that

The first part (from the first verse to the sixth inclusive) is, according to Eichhorn, written with the name Jehovah, and has all the tone and manner of the Jehovah genealogies in the tenth chapter.

And that the second part (from the seventh verse to the

tenth inclusive) is written with the name Elohim, and seems to stand in connexion with, and to close the narrative contained in the twenty-third chapter.

If now we review this history of Abraham, we find,

i. That the actions which it attributes to him are either religious or secular; and we find moreover:

In the first place: That as religious, they are:

1. Spontaneous, the result of his own religious feelings, or religious education. Thus, of his own motion, he erects altars to, and calls upon the name of, the Lord, and gives tithes of his spoil to Melchisedek; and of his own motion intercedes with Jehovah for the doomed inhabitants of the plain.

Or,

2. Commanded: i.e. acts performed in obedience to the commands, or supposed commands, of the Deity; i. e. acts to which the Divine command alone gave a religious character. Thus Abraham left his father's house and wandered through the land of Canaan; thus too he prepared a great sacrifice, and instituted the rite of circumcision, and, though old and childless, believed in the greatness of his posterity; thus also he drove Hagar from his home, and prepared to slay his own son Isaac. Of these acts, of which the responsibility is thrown upon the Deity, we cannot but observe, that no one of them is, *in itself and by itself*, a moral act,—that they are all either acts from which, as having no moral feature, we can draw no moral conclusions; or acts which, as absolutely criminal, we should but for the context attribute only to a weak or immoral man.

Secondly. That as secular, they are, judging them by our view of morality,

1. Morally indifferent. Such were Abraham's journeys to Egypt and Gerar; such his separation from Lot, his covenant with Abimelech, his purchase of Machpelah, and the measures which he takes for the marriage of his son Isaac.

2. Criminal, and such as display a weak and timid character. Such were his falsehoods to the kings of Egypt and Gerar; and such his neglect to shield Hagar from the too bitter persecution of Sarah. And

3. Praiseworthy. Such was his rescue of Lot; such his refusal to partake of the spoils of Sodom; and such his generous hospitality.

But it may here be asked—why is it that when we thus view each act of his by itself we judge Abraham so little, and that when we read his history we feel that he is so great? We take but a narrow or even a false view of greatness. We associate it only with the names of men who represent great events or world-renowned systems, or who live in feats of magnificent daring, or heroic self-devotion; we know only of great patriots, great warriors, great philosophers, and great statesmen; we are so occupied with the greatness which thrusts itself upon our notice, that we have no eye for the serene dignity of him who silently walks in the even path of duty. Hence it is that by the aid of traditions and fables, or by an addition here, an omission there, some among us have managed to endow Abraham with all learning, and courage, and virtue, and to magnify him into something more than man: while *others* (forgetful that our every-day conduct is an evidence not so much of our character as of our education and the opinions of our age) have analyzed his actions and dwarfed him down to the low proportions of a degraded Humanity. Let us endeavour to judge him fairly and honestly. As a religious man then, Abraham, though born of an idolatrous family, early apprehended the unity of the Godhead. In the Deity he saw the great Creator, the Almighty, the Judge of the earth; to God he devoted himself and his household, and he worshipped God by doing justice and judgment.³ As a prince (though of an age in which princes were regarded as above all law, and in which the strong because they were strong oppressed the weak

³ Gen. xviii. 19.

because they were weak), Abraham (and he was strong and powerful among the strongest and the most powerful), ever bore himself meekly, as a man eminently of peace, and with somewhat of the indolence and apathy which belong to that character. He ever respects the rights of others; he avoids all causes of contention and dispute; he suffers wrong patiently, and claims its redress without arrogance; he negotiates where he might command, and purchases where he might seize. Once only is he roused out of his peaceful mood, once only he arms himself for the battle, and then he goes forth to the rescue of his friends and brother, and then he proves himself as intrepid a warrior as he is a generous ally. But for this one expedition, we had not perhaps recognised the slumbering lion. Lastly, as a private man: Abraham was a man of contemplative and imaginative mind: he loved the desert and the silent grove, and mixed unwillingly in the noise and traffic of cities: gentle and amiable to a fault, he avoided the business of life, and either too readily left things to take their own course, or too readily gave up to others the management of his domestic affairs: he shuts his eyes to the quarrels of his household: he will not act until compelled to act; his authority must be appealed to ere he will interfere: but when called upon to declare himself, he acts it must be allowed unselfishly, worthily he resolves on, and sedulously and at any sacrifice performs, what he conceives to be his duty. We need the help of no fables, and no systems, to admire, in Abraham, the moral ideal of infant man.

II. That it records several communications which the Deity vouchsafes at different times to different persons,—as Abraham, Hagar, Abimelech. And these communications are,

1st. Audible merely, and are generally introduced to our notice by the formula, “Jehovah said,” “the Elohim said.” And they are then put before us,

1st. Without any information as to the time when they occurred, or the place whence the voice

in which they were uttered seemed to proceed. Thus Jehovah speaks in chapters xii, 1, and xiii, 14, but whether from heaven, or in the man's ear, or from the man's heart, or whether in the broad day, when the mind is awake and active, or during the night in dreams and visions, are matters of which the record leaves us in ignorance.

2ndly. With the time *expressed or implied* of their occurrence. Thus the word of Jehovah comes to Abraham in a vision (chapter xv, 1); and in the night the Elohim addresses him (chapters xxi, 12, and xxii, 1). And

3rdly. With all the circumstances of both time and place. Thus during the day *out of heaven* the angel of the Elohim called unto Hagar (chapter xxi); and the angel of Jehovah unto Abraham (chapter xxii, 12).

2ndly. Audible and visible; i. e. to the communication is attached some supernatural appearance. And that appearance,

1st. Is simply affirmed without any circumstances of time, &c. Thus Jehovah appears (chapter xxii, 7); the Elohim or Jehovah (chapter xvii, 1). And

2ndly. Takes place during the night, in sleep, thus the Elohim came to Abimelech in a dream by night (xx. 3), and by night Jehovah appeared to Abraham as a lamp of fire (xv. 17); and

3rdly. It occurs in the broad day; and the vision consists then of an angel of Jehovah, as in Hagar's case (xvi.); or of Jehovah and two angels, as in Abraham's (xviii); or of two angels, as in Lot's (xix).

Of these several communications we may observe—

1st. That the more indefinite as regard time and circumstances, and those also which are stated as having occurred during the night, are all referred to *the Deity himself*, whether Jehovah or Elohim.

2ndly. That all those which may be placed in the day

time are attributed to angels, whether of the Elohim or Jehovah, or to the Deity—but to the Deity as Jehovah, and to him accompanied by angels.

3rdly. That whenever Jehovah and his angels appear—except in chapter xv, 17, where Jehovah appears alone and during the night, and appears as a burning lamp—they clearly appear in human shape, and are no way distinguishable from other men.

4thly. That whenever an angel appears, the narrative so speaks of him, that it is at least doubtful whether he is not the Deity himself.

III. That men were united into societies, amongst which we distinguish—

1st. That of the family, but of the family without any fixed habitation, and wandering whithersoever its wants or a vagrant will might lead it. The family consisted of the father or patriarch, his wives and children, and servants from different countries, and numerous herds of cattle.⁴ Over his cattle and household, the patriarch was absolute lord, they were his property, and he might literally do what he would with his own. He was their will, their religion, their representative before God, and in his piety they were blessed and for his sin punished. Of this society the empire of China as we have seen it represented by the popular superstition may be considered a development.

2ndly. That of the family, but settled in the city and occupied with agriculture. Such a society was that formed by the children of Heth. As the descendants of Heth increased in numbers and grew into a people, they founded a city, and—though they most probably did not interfere with the laws and customs of the family—they vested, it would seem, the government not in any elected body, but in the citizens generally, before whom all transactions

⁴ I put the cattle with and after the servants, because I invariably find them so placed in Genesis.

between citizen and citizen were laid, and who by vote decided all disputes.

3rdly. That of the city, but of the city as the property, as existing for the sole use and benefit of one man.⁵ Such seems to have been the city of Gerar, the city of Abimelech and of his servants, men of no name or nation; a city rich in cattle, and neglectful of the peaceful arts of agriculture,⁶ a heroic city, a city of Bedouins,⁷ for which war and rapine were a trade—unless indeed the host of Abimelech was intended rather to intimidate his own subjects⁸ than to plunder the territories of his neighbours.

4thly. That of the commercial city. Such was Sodom—a city of men collected from all parts; a city of peace which the stranger approached without fear, and in which, *for money*, he found all the conveniences of life; a rich city, luxurious, effeminate, unwarlike; a city of freemen and freedmen, in which all rank, and consequently all religion,⁹

⁵ Vide note quoted above from Wachsmuth, *Ant. of Greece*, i, 123.

⁶ As we may gather, 1st, from the permission given to Abraham in chapter xx, a permission which supposes an open and uncultivated country; and 2ndly, from the occasion of the dispute between Abraham's and Abimelech's servants.

⁷ I say a city of Bedouins, because this Phichol, whom I find again chapter xxvi, with Abimelech, reminds me of a Bedouin custom. Among the Bedouins, the office of agyd or general, like that of sheikh, is hereditary. "And the Arabs," says Burckhardt, "submit to the command of an agyd whom they know to be deficient both in bravery and judgment, rather than yield to the orders of their sheikh during the actual expedition."—Notes on the Bedouins, vol. i, p. 296. Is not this Abimelech the sheikh, Phichol the agyd? and may not time have modified the relation in which the sheikh once stood to his followers?

⁸ Does not Abimelech's covenant with Abraham, his anxiety for Abraham's friendship, coupled with the very different tone which the Abimelech of chapter xxvi uses—and king, not of Gerar, but of the Philistines—seem to imply that his subjects were beginning to grow disaffected, to demand the redress of wrongs, &c.?

⁹ "The notion of citizenship," says Wachsmuth, "existed only in so far as the condition of aliens and domestic slaves was its negative: at this stage the nobility and the lower order of people alone attract attention, as *essentially distinct ingredients of the union, and as subject to different laws*.....The poetic legend recounts no rising of the nobles out of the mass; it forges links between the heroic and the divine races, but between the heroes and the populace it interposes a chasm which *forbids them to intermingle*."—*Antiq. of Greece*, vol. i, p. 114; see also *ib.* p. 118, &c.

was disregarded; a democratic city,¹ governed by magistrates chosen by the people from among the citizens;² a city governed by laws, but in which the laws were little regarded. Sodom appears as the type of an ochlocracy.³

5thly. That which results from the association of several cities together for purposes either of war, as the alliance between the cities of the plain, &c. or of government, as between the several cities which united together in the sovereign formed the kingdom of Egypt.

Of the state of society during this period we can form no definite idea. We perceive however that these several cities and nations, though each one was in itself an independent state, do not stand alone and isolated, but that they are rather bound and connected together by ties of commerce or friendship; we find that travellers, whether merchants or nomads, carry with them the news of events which have happened at a distance (xxii, 20), and by their relations spread abroad a knowledge of the productions of different countries (xii, 10, xiii, 10) and of the character of different people (xii, 12, xx, 1, 2); and we guess moreover that between the great marts of traffic, the plains of Babylon and the Nile, frequent caravans have already traced a route. We see the precious metals used as a means of exchange and wrought into ornaments for the person; camels and asses employed as beasts of burden and for

¹ "Das tyrannisirende Volk," observes Von Raumer, "handelt wahnsinnig in eigenem Namen, Handlanger eines Tyrannen handeln niederträchtig in fremdem Namen."—Beyträge z. neu. Gesch. Europa, III, vol. i, p. 152; vide chap. xix, verses 4, &c.

² Vide xix. 9.

³ I do not mean to say that all this is in the text; but from the text I am justified in regarding Heth, Gerar and Sodom, as cities of very different kinds; and the question is, whether I have taken a right view of their characters. Between Sodom and Gerar observe

the differences. The people of Sodom are punished for their own sin,—those of Gerar for Abimelech's. Sodom Abraham approaches with confidence; in Sodom Lot settles and marries his daughters. Gerar Abraham enters with precaution, but in Gerar he is received hospitably; while, but for Lot, no one (?) in Sodom would have entertained the angels. It is true that Sodom, like Gerar, has its king; but in Sodom the king appears only to command its armies,—in Gerar we hear only of the king. I think these differences warrant the conclusions I have drawn.

riding. In the house we find numerous servants, who seem to have been in general kindly treated by their masters, and sometimes to have held in their master's heart the place of children.⁴ To the wife all domestic arrangements, the economy of the household appears to have been left, she distributed the provisions necessary for the day, and on great occasions herself superintended the preparation of them. As articles of food we have fine meal baked into cakes, meat dressed with sauce, milk and butter and wine. Of the articles of dress, we know neither the material nor the fashion; though indeed as raiment is among the presents sent to Rebecca, and a veil Abimelech's peace offering to Sarah; we may guess that it was not confined to mere clothing, but was both costly and magnificent. Such and so indefinite are the fragments we can gather of the mode of life and civilisation of the Abrahamic times.

⁴ Vide the chapter which enjoins circumcision.

FINIS.

473-57

No Records

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



48 455 665

